

Loma Linda University
**TheScholarsRepository@LLU: Digital Archive of Research,
Scholarship & Creative Works**

Loma Linda University Electronic Theses, Dissertations & Projects

6-1-2010

Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy: Gender Role Attitudes and Spousal Support in Botswana

Kagelo Henry Rakwena
Loma Linda University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarsrepository.llu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Marriage and Family Therapy and Counseling Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rakwena, Kagelo Henry, "Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy: Gender Role Attitudes and Spousal Support in Botswana" (2010). *Loma Linda University Electronic Theses, Dissertations & Projects*. 9.
<http://scholarsrepository.llu.edu/etd/9>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by TheScholarsRepository@LLU: Digital Archive of Research, Scholarship & Creative Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loma Linda University Electronic Theses, Dissertations & Projects by an authorized administrator of TheScholarsRepository@LLU: Digital Archive of Research, Scholarship & Creative Works. For more information, please contact scholarsrepository@llu.edu.

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
School of Science and Technology
in conjunction with the
Faculty of Graduate Studies

Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy: Gender Role Attitudes and
Spousal Support in Botswana

by

Kagelo Henry Rakwena

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Marital and Family Therapy

June 2010

© 2010

Kagelo Henry Rakwena
All Rights Reserved

Each person whose signature appears below certifies that this dissertation in his/her opinion is adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.

_____, Chairperson
Colwick M. Wilson, Department Chair and Professor of Counseling and Family Sciences

Curtis A. Fox, Professor of Counseling and Family Sciences

Louis Jenkins, Department Chair and Professor of Psychology

Cheryl Simpson, Professor of Counseling and Family Sciences

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to the individuals and organizations that were instrumental in the completion of this study. My sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Colwick M. Wilson, the chair of my research committee, for sharing his expertise in the development and process of this study and his guidance in the preparation of this manuscript. I am grateful to Dr. Curtis A. Fox, Dr. Cheryl Simpson and Dr. Louis Jenkins, members of my research committee, for their insights and recommendations to help with this project. Additionally, I am grateful to the faculty and staff at Loma Linda University Department of Counseling and Family Sciences for their guidance and support as I made this journey.

To my research team in Botswana, Lame Mokotedi, the research team leader and the team members, I am thankful for your time and resources as you collected data for this project. Another thank-you goes to each participant for taking time to participate in this dissertation research. I am also grateful to the government of the Republic of Botswana, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs, for granting me the opportunity to carry out this study in Gaborone, Botswana.

I would also like to thank my family and friends, your love and support through this long endeavor has been treasured and I could not have finished without you. Thanks for your prayers and timely words of encouragement. These have been precious and sustaining me during these years. And finally, I would like to thank God for providing me the undeserved opportunity to study this part of His creation, human relationships, and marvel in its complexity.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my wife, Boitumelo and to my daughters, Kanelo and Tetelo, whose presence, love, support and inspiration made this academic, professional and spiritual journey possible. This work is also dedicated to my parents, Morwadi Rakwena (my mother) and Kgotlaetsile and Grace Mokotedi (my in-laws), who waited patiently as my family and I were in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS

Approval Page.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Dedication... ..	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
Abstract.....	xi
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Overview of the African World View	4
Marriage and Procreation.....	4
Kinship and Community	5
Religion/Spirituality.....	7
Concept of Time	8
Urbanization.....	9
Overview of the Republic of Botswana.....	10
Objectives	14
Rationale	15
2. Conceptual Framework.....	18
3. Review of Literature	22
Marital Satisfaction.....	22
Intimacy	24
Gender Role Attitudes, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy.....	26
Spousal Support, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy.....	28
Age, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	31
Age and Marital Satisfaction	31
Age and Intimacy.....	33
Gender, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	34
Gender and Marital Satisfaction	34

Gender and Intimacy	37
Number of Children, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	41
Religion, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	46
Occupation, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	49
Education, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	53
Length of Marriage, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	56
Household Income, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy	59
4. Methods	63
Participants	63
Method of Data Collection	64
Variables and Measurements	65
Dependent Variables	66
Main Independent Variables	68
Control Variables	69
Statistical Analyses	70
5. Results	76
Hypothesis 1	81
Hypothesis 2	88
Hypothesis 3	93
Hypothesis 4	97
Hypothesis 5	102
Hypothesis 6	106
Hypothesis 7	109
6. Discussion and Implications	114
Discussion	114
Limitations of the Research	122
Implications for Future Research	123
Theoretical Implications	124
Clinical Practice	125
References	128
Appendices	144
A. Introduction	144
B. Informed Consent	145

C. Instructions	147
D. Demographic Questionnaire	148
E. Gender Role Attitudes.....	150
F. Spousal Support	151
G. Dyadic Adjustment Scale.....	152
H. Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory	155
I. Setswana Version of the Questionnaire	158
J. Hypotheses 1 to 7 Subscales Tables	167
K. Letter of Authorization/Collaboration	179

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Demographics of the Sample.....	78
2. Means Scores of MS, Intimacy and Subscales	79
3. Mean Scores of GRA and SS	80
4. Mean Scores of Marital Satisfaction by Age and Gender.....	80
5. Mean Scores of Intimacy by Age and Gender	81
6. Marital Satisfaction by GRA	85
7. Marital Satisfaction Subscales by GRA.....	86
8. Intimacy by GRA	87
9. Intimacy Subscales by GRA	88
10. Marital Satisfaction by Spousal Support	90
11. Marital Satisfaction Subscales by Spousal Support	91
12. Intimacy by Spousal Support.....	92
13. Intimacy Subscales by Spousal Support	93
14. Marital Satisfaction by Age	94
15. Marital Satisfaction Subscales by Age	95
16. Intimacy by Age	96
17. Intimacy Subscales by Age	97
18. Marital Satisfaction by Gender	99

19.	Marital Satisfaction Subscales by Gender	100
20.	Intimacy by Gender.....	100
21.	Intimacy Subscales by Gender	102
22.	Marital Satisfaction by the Interaction of Age and Gender	103
23.	MS Subscales by the Interaction of Age and Gender	104
24.	Intimacy by the Interaction of Age and Gender.....	105
25.	Intimacy Subscales by the Interaction of Age and Gender	106
26.	Marital Satisfaction by Age, Gender, SS and GRA	108
27.	MS Subscales by Age, Gender, SS and GRA	109
28.	Intimacy by Age, Gender, GRA and SS	111
29.	Intimacy Subscales by Age, Gender, GRA and SS	112

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy: Gender Role Attitudes and Spousal Support in Botswana

by

Kagelo Henry Rakwena

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Marital and Family Therapy

Loma Linda University, June 2010

Dr. Wilson, Colwick M., Chairperson

In this study, the predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy were examined within an African context that is characterized by a fast growing economy, migrant population, urbanization and industrialization. Specifically, this study examined the role of two relational variables, gender role attitudes and spousal support and two demographic variables, age and gender in predicting the variance in marital satisfaction and intimacy, after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income among married individuals in Botswana.

The results of this study reveal the importance of gender role attitudes and spousal support as key predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy when compared to age and gender. That is, individuals who reported high scores in spousal support and egalitarian gender role attitudes also reported high scores in marital satisfaction and intimacy. Gender and age were not related to both outcomes used in this study.

The findings in this study will be of benefit to mental health professionals (a fairly new profession in Botswana), marriage officers, pastors and family life educators, as they deal with married and prospective couples in Botswana. Mental health professionals in Botswana will be able to explore the perspectives of married individuals on gender role

attitudes and spousal support within the context of their marital relationships. The results of this study provide some support for the use of family therapy interventions in Botswana and neighboring countries, open a dialogue among couples regarding marital expectations and what they bring in from families of origin and provoke some thoughts among family educators in creating interventions relevant to the African context.

Introduction

Marital satisfaction and intimacy are sought, or at least expected, by most married individuals. However, in 2004 the United States Bureau of Census reported that about fifty percent of marriages in the United States end in divorce. Some of the reasons that are given for this high divorce rate include increasing numbers of married women joining the labor force, preschool mothers entering and remaining in the labor force and changing gender roles, and their related impact on couple's interactions (United States Bureau of Census, 2004). In addition, Wallerstein and Lewis (2005) argue that due to the fact that divorce has lost its former stigma, the presence of experiences of abandonment and lack of healthy role models during childhood are implicated in higher divorce rates.

Divorce, at least in part, could be viewed as a function of marital discord and or dissatisfaction within the dyad. On the contrary, marital satisfaction to a large extent may be related to an increased likelihood of couples staying together longer. Marital satisfaction is defined as the global evaluation of a couple's marriage as viewed by each spouse (Sternberg and Hojjat, 1997). Therefore, marital satisfaction focuses on the subjective evaluation of the experiences of the individual's happiness and contentment within the relationship. Bradbury and colleagues (2000) state that marital satisfaction, through the years, has been found to be correlated with a number of different variables across varying settings and couple relationships. For instance, the following are some of the factors that are important predictors of marital satisfaction: communication skills, expression of affection, problem solving skills, social support, and the relative degree of pleasure within the relationship (Haynes et al., 1992).

On the other hand, scholars have identified factors that are descriptive of marital dissatisfaction. Buehlman, Gottman and Katz (1992) discuss how chaos within a relationship, a lack of problem solving skills, the absence of hope and commitment in a relationship, depression and feelings of defeat with regard to the relationship could bring marital dissatisfaction. Grote and Clark (2001) have also discovered that perceived unfairness within a relationship and the existing or the perceived inequities could initiate marital dissatisfaction. Moreover, Shapiro, Gottman and Carrère (2000) contend that transition to parenthood coexists with a decrease in marital satisfaction, and in positive interchanges between marital partners and an increase in conflict between the parties.

Low levels of conflict if they are not dealt with early on in the relationship increase the probability of high levels of marital dissatisfaction (Grote & Clark, 2001). Dealing with emotionally charged issues when they present themselves will assist couples in facing the challenges in constructive ways and thereby prevent permanent damage within the relationship (Grote & Clark, 2001). Unresolved conflicts are said to have the potential to negatively condition a partner's future response tendencies in relation to the other partner (Levenson & Gottman, 1985).

In addition to marital satisfaction, intimacy is considered to be at the core of loving relationships and a major bonding force in marriage (Beck, 1988; Levinger, 1988). Intimacy is highly regarded in marriage because it solidifies a couple's commitment to sustaining the relationship and is positively associated with marital satisfaction (Kenny & Acitelli, 1994; Schaefer & Olson, 1981; Waring et al., 1981).

Schaffer and Olson (1981) define marital intimacy as a process involving seven types of intimacy: (1) emotional intimacy – closeness created through sharing feelings;

(2) social intimacy – having common friends and similarities in social networks; (3) intellectual intimacy – mutual understanding about issues, the experience of sharing ideas and goals; (4) sexual intimacy – the experience of sharing general affection and /or sexual activity, including sexual frequency that both spouses are satisfied with and an open dialogue about sex; (5) recreational intimacy – mutual participation in sports and shared interests in hobbies such as reading, watching a movie and cooking; (6) spiritual intimacy – having a similar sense of meaning in life, and/or religious faiths, beliefs and practices and (7) aesthetic intimacy – the closeness that comes through the experience of sharing beauty. From the definitions of marital satisfaction and intimacy, these two variables have long been linked together for marital outcomes (Kenny & Acitelli, 1994). These seven constructs of intimacy address the different areas of couples' lives and how spouses relate to each other in these areas. Therefore, studying these concepts together could potentially increase our understanding of the dynamics of the quality of marital relationships in Botswana.

Furthermore, the impact of low levels of marital satisfaction can be seen in the avoidance of intimacy that is characteristic of distressed marriages (Davila and Bradbury, 2001). This may be due to the fact that spouses who do not feel valued and accepted respond to feelings of pain by behaving poorly toward their partners, while those who feel valued respond to feelings of hurt by drawing closer to their partners. Intimates who feel less valued and less accepted by their partners react to the pain of being vulnerable by withdrawing and distancing themselves from the relationship in an attempt to give their partner less power to hurt them in the future (Murray et al., 2003). Wives appear to

be especially vulnerable in this respect, and research has shown that women appear to move in and out of negative affect more frequently than husbands do (Griffin, 1993).

In this study, marital satisfaction and intimacy were examined, looking at the significant predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy within an African context that is characterized by a fast growing economy, migrant population, urbanization and industrialization. The study examined how marital satisfaction and intimacy may be influenced by gender role attitudes and spousal support and how marital satisfaction and intimacy varied by age and gender. The study was conducted in Gaborone, the capital city of the Republic of Botswana, in a context of the African world view of community and kinship which are being challenged by urbanization and industrialization. Specifically, the study examined the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy by two relational variables, gender role attitudes and spousal support and by two demographic variables, age and gender, after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income among married individuals in Botswana.

Overview of the African World View

Marriage and procreation. Marriage and having children, in many African societies, is the focus of existence and also a point where all the members of a community meet: the deceased, the living and the urban children. It is a complex affair which comes with economic, social, religious and tribal responsibilities which often overlap so firmly that they cannot be separated. It is also a duty, a requirement, from the

corporate community and whoever does not participate in marriage becomes a social outcast (Mbiti, 1990).

A traditional African marriage links and bonds the two families through the union of a man and a woman (Osei, 1971). The couple is expected to continue to be economically and socially responsible to their families of origin. Marriage is primarily for social status (Wiredu, 1980) and for procreation (Wiredu & Gyekye, 1992).

Marriage without children is incomplete. Marriage and procreation are inseparable unity that is expected from every “normal” human being, or under normal circumstances, in one’s community. The importance of procreation in marriage is to recapture immortality, to “remember” the dead and to continue their “existence” in the lives of their descendants (Mbiti, 1990). It is believed that the aim of human life is to get married and to have children (Apostel, 1981).

Kinship and community. The deep sense of kinship has been one of the strongest forces in traditional African life. Kinship means that each individual is related, in one way or another, to other people in the community. Kinship is reckoned through blood, engagement and marital relationships. It is kinship which controls social relationships between people in a given community: it governs marital customs and regulations; it determines the behavior of one individual toward another. This sense of kinship binds together families and the entire life of tribes (Higgs, 2003; Mbiti, 1990).

Kinship in traditional Africa is mostly social in focus, and where social kinship and the biological kinship diverge, the social prevails. Kinship fosters life of interdependence, community and living in considerate attitude toward others. There is a sense of responsibility and respect toward the immediate family members, neighbors and

to one's community (Wiredu & Gyekye, 1992). This humane attitude (humanness) toward other human beings is referred to as "ubuntu" (or "botho" in Setswana). This humane attitude is born out of the realization that each individual is part of a community and as fellow human beings we need to respect, honor each other and bear each other's burdens. This is seeing other's needs, interests and dignity as of fundamental importance and concern and the ability to affirm one's humanity by recognizing the humanity of others (Higgs, 2003; Bell, 2002; Apostel, 1981).

In traditional Africa, people are inclined to sacrifice their children's opportunities in favor of their nephews and nieces, and individuals make decisions on important matters of their lives in consultation with the interests of their lineage or kin group. It is the community, the group, that determines the life which must be followed, and it is the coherent embodiment of something higher than each individual. The community, instead of individuals, enhances the spirit of helpfulness, shared responsibility and being a good neighbor. A village is made up of several joint families, each occupying a distinct ward, a cooperative union of families (Osei, 1971).

Both in traditional and modern Africa, nations, societies, villages and people are still recognized by tribes, languages and by geographic regions where they were born. Though people identify themselves as related to one another in their tribes and communities, and a nation, tribes and families are still distinct from one another. This distinction by tribes and languages can be a challenge when one marries from a different tribe (different rituals, religions and customs) and that political affiliation could go by tribe too (Mbiti, 1990).

Religion/spirituality. Africans in general, have different myths and stories, which talk about God's existence, creation and sustaining of life. They believe in a spirit world, made up of spirits that have always been there and are joined by those who die to continue to intercede for humans (Mbiti, 1990; Apostel, 1981). Africans believe that there is One Great God who is the creator and sustainer of everything. This God is seen as an internal member of the community, who is ever present and accessible through spirits, ancestors and gods. After death it is believed that the dead join the spirit world, the ancestors, and continue to be part of the community. The ancestors, the spirits and gods are, therefore, the mediators between the Great God and the living (Wiredu, 1980; Masolo, 1994).

There are several things that verify and express how spiritual, or religious, Africans have been through the centuries. These include their names, poetry, art, proverbs, short statements, songs, prayers, myths, stories and religious ceremonies. In addition, most communities have diviners, rainmakers and the medicine men who are said to receive revelations from God and at times have to consult God on behalf of their people through prayers and sacrifices (Mbiti, 1990).

It is generally believed that the diviners, rainmakers and the medicine men receive their knowledge and powers from God and that at times God appears to them in dreams. In many occasions, such as in times of rain seasons, illness, barrenness, searching for the lost animals, marriage and death, diviners lead out in ceremonies that evoke the power and presence of God, the gods and ancestors (Mbiti, 1990).

The Great God, as an important member of the community, also participates in bringing about the community's governing body. That is, God is present in the process of

selecting the governing body, of the chiefs, kings and counselors and that the governing laws and ethics are based on religious principles as the community has come to believe them (Bell, 2002).

Concept of time. In traditional Africa, the concept of time is of little or no concern. For them, time is simply a composition of events which have occurred, those which are currently taking place and those which are immediately to occur. What has not taken place, or what has no likelihood of an immediate occurrence falls in the category of “No-time.” What is certain to take place, or what falls within the rhythm of natural phenomena, is in the category of inevitable or potential time (Mbiti, 1990).

Instead of calendars of days and events, traditional Africans have phenomenon calendars. In phenomenon calendars, events which constitute time are reckoned or considered in their relation with one another and as they take place. One’s life, or human history, is divided up or reckoned according to their specific events, for it is these events that make a month, or a year, and history meaningful. For example, a mother counts months of her pregnancy, traveler counts the days it takes him to reach another area, during the reign of so-and-so something happened, going to bed at night but not necessarily at nine or twelve, the event counts more than a specific time (English & Kalumba, 1996).

For traditional Africans, time is mainly made of two dimensions: a long past and a present, with virtually no future. The future is absent because the events which lie in the future have not taken place, and therefore, they cannot be part of time. For instance, events that fall within the rhythm of life at an individual level include: birth, puberty, initiation, marriage, procreation, old age, death and entering the spirit world. Community

events include: cycles of seasons with their different activities, such as sowing, harvesting and hunting (English and Kalumba, 1996; Mbiti, 1990).

Urbanization. African countries are affected by urbanization, modernity and globalization. Urbanization, which comes with many people living for jobs and education in towns and cities, negatively impacts the fabric of African communal life, social structure and economics (Bell, 2002). Urbanization and technological developments are processes that have come along with influxes of populations moving from the villages into the cities. These developments are disrupting the cultural and protective connections which generate bonds and fellowship among traditional Africans. For instance, mass population movements interfere with customs, rituals, religion, ethics and social relationships which were once upheld in the villages (Wired & Gyekye, 1992).

Specifically, urbanization in Africa comes with the following: (a) less dependence and consultation of uncles, aunts and grandparents in terms of making decisions about marriage and raising children. The family is now made of mainly parents and their children, with less and less dependence on the extended family, (b) variety of religions: one can join any religion of choice, different from where one was born, (c) tribal solidarity is disrupted, and nationhood takes over, and (d) mixed marriages: marrying from different tribes, at times from different nationalities, less preparation for married life, and marital problems and divorce rates are on the increase (Mbiti, 1990).

The African world view plays an important context in this study as it highlights social support, the importance of children within marriage, religion and how urbanization impacts African societies. This study examines how married people view their marital satisfaction and intimacy while controlling for some of these important concepts, such as

number of children, time in marriage and religion. In addition, the study examines how the sample from Botswana, an African context, view their marital quality and closeness in terms of gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender.

Overview of the Republic of Botswana

The Republic of Botswana is a landlocked country in the southern part of Africa. It is bordered by South Africa to the south, Namibia to the west, Zambia to the north, and Zimbabwe to the northeast. The Batswana, a term also used to denote all citizens of Botswana, refers to the country's major ethnic group (the "Tswana" in South Africa), which came into the area from South Africa during the Zulu wars of the early 1800s. English is the official language, but Setswana is spoken widely. Formerly the British protectorate of Bechuanaland, Botswana adopted its new name after becoming independent on September 30, 1966. At an area of 231,788 square miles (600,370 square kilometers), Botswana is the world's 45th-largest country (after Ukraine). It is comparable in size to Madagascar and is slightly smaller than the state of Texas in the United States.

Botswana's capital city is Gaborone. As the capital city of Botswana, Gaborone is the seat of government as well as the country's commercial and administrative center. The city is described as the fastest growing city in Africa. Compared to other villages and cities in Botswana, Gaborone holds the largest population. The estimated population of Gaborone in 2006 was 200,000 while the country's population was estimated to be 1.7 million (Wikipedia, 2008). Compared to its neighboring countries, such as Zimbabwe,

South Africa and Zambia, which have a population of over 10 million each, Botswana has less than 2 million (Maundeni, 2002).

Prior to European contact, Batswana lived as herders and farmers under tribal rule. In the 19th century, as hostilities broke out between Batswana and White settlers from the Transvaal, the British Government in 1885 put "Bechuanaland" under its protection. In June, 1964, Britain accepted proposals for democratic self-government in Botswana. The seat of government was moved from Mafikeng, in South Africa, to newly established Gaborone in 1965. The 1965 constitution led to the first general elections and to independence in September 1966. Seretse Khama, a leader in the independence movement, was elected as the first president, re-elected twice, and died in office in 1980 (U.S. Department of State, 2008).

After the death of the first president, the presidency passed to the sitting vice president, Ketumile Masire, who was elected in his own right in 1984 and re-elected in 1989 and 1994. Masire retired from office in 1998. The presidency passed to the sitting vice president, Festus Mogae, who was elected in his own right in 1999 and re-elected in 2004. Mogae retired from office on the 31st of March 2008, and the presidency has passed to his vice, Lieutenant General Seretse Khama Ian Khama, a year before the general elections. Lieutenant General Seretse Khama Ian Khama is the son of the first president of Botswana and he is also the former leader of the Botswana army (U.S. Department of State, 2008).

The country's economy, closely tied to South Africa's, is dominated by mining (especially diamonds), cattle rearing and tourism. Since independence, Botswana has had one of the fastest economic growth rates in the world. Botswana has transformed itself

from being one of the poorest countries in the world to a middle-income country.

Economic growth averaged over 9% per year from 1966 to 1999. The World Economic Forum rates Botswana as one of the two most economically competitive nations in Africa (U.S. Department of State, 2008).

In the Republic of Botswana, the patriarchal sex/gender systems relegate males to positions of power and women to subordinate positions within the context of cultural beliefs and practices. Patriarchal beliefs are based in cultural beliefs (Mookodi, Ntshebe & Taylor, 2004). Tswana culture makes a clear division between the public-political and the private-domestic spheres—women are largely relegated to domestic activities of childcare, and home maintenance. Men continue to dominate the arena of political decision-making within traditional political forums, such as the ‘kgotla,’ the house of chiefs and parliament (Mookodi, Ntshebe & Taylor, 2004).

While women form a significant proportion of the electorate, they hold very few political positions (Mookodi, Ntshebe & Taylor, 2004). Gender differences occur in the education of females and males. While there are equal enrollment rates for females and males in the first nine years of schooling, the enrollment figures for males outnumber those of females in higher levels of education, including vocational training schools. Enrollment rates at the only university in Botswana, the University of Botswana, show that the highest gender discrepancies are in the fields of engineering and technology, as well as the Faculty of Science, where the ratios of males to females are approximately 8:1 and 3:1, respectively (Mookodi, Ntshebe & Taylor, 2004).

Van Hook (1994) points out that industrialization and urbanization in Botswana tend to continue the traditional hierarchy of men over women. While economic and social

developments have positively influenced the role of women, there are barriers that many women still have to overcome in the legal, educational, economic and family spheres. For instance, with more women currently on formal employment, especially in the cities, the traditional understanding of the husband as the sole breadwinner and the woman as the housekeeper is undergoing transformation. It is, however, still expected that the man should bear the major responsibility for earning the family its livelihood while the woman continues to have a larger share of domestic responsibilities. The young middle-class women are caught between the modern expectations of having an education and a career and the traditional valuing of children, getting exhausted as they are torn between work and family responsibilities.

In his literature review on the transmission of HIV in Botswana, Macdonald (1996) makes some observations about economic migration that could affect Tswana family life in Botswana. First, many men still leave their families to go and work in the mines, either in South Africa or newly established mines in Botswana. Second, many households traditionally maintain several homes which they regularly move between. That is, one home in the village, one at the 'lands' or farm, one at the cattle post and, in recent years, another home in a town. Third, there is the rapidly expanding Civil Service sector requirement for workers who are willing and able to relocate to new jobs and reassignments. In addition to the three factors cited above, is the fact that there are good roads and transportation which facilitate many couples to be geographically separated, sometimes for long periods of time. Further, while the country as a whole is regarded as having the most mobile population in the world, Gaborone, its capital city, has become the center of the country's labor migration.

This study investigated how gender role attitudes, spousal support, gender and age play out on marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana, in a context of a fast growing economy and migrant population and in the context of the African world view which is being challenged by urbanization and industrialization. Despite the importance of marital satisfaction and intimacy in marriage, an exhaustive review of the research literature on Botswana families yielded no empirical studies that have examined marital satisfaction and intimacy among married couples. This study addresses this gap through an empirical examination of marital satisfaction and intimacy by gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender in Botswana by looking at the self-reported experiences of married individuals who were living in Gaborone at the time of the study. This study is important to marriage and family therapists and family educators as it provides information of how married individuals view their marital relationships in the midst of migration and industrialization.

Objectives

Although marriage has been an on-going topic of research since the 1930's (Gottman and Krokoff, 1989) and continues to be so today, attempts at increasing marital satisfaction, intimacy and duration of marriage seem to be limited in their effectiveness. However, attempts at predicting marital success seem to have become paramount due to the continuing high rates of divorce and high levels of marital distress, which are regarded as the main reason for individuals seeking professional help (Fincham, Garnier, Gano-Phillips & Osborne, 1995). For instance, as early as 1977, one study proposed that at least 15 to 20% of all marriages consist of couples who are not happy together but for

various reasons have decided to stay together (Landis, 1977). Recent studies indicate that marital satisfaction levels of couples who stay married have been declining since the 1970s (National Project, 1999; Rogers & Amato, 1997). While research literature on Botswana families yielded no empirical studies that have examined marital satisfaction and intimacy, Maundeni (2002) observes that marital unhappiness and divorce rates in developing countries such as Botswana, South Africa, Nigeria and Ghana, are on the rise, leaving mothers and children to face economic challenges.

There are several factors that may contribute to poor marital outcomes and divorce. The research literature points out that marital outcome may differ by demographic variables, such as age and socio-economic status (Steinburg and Silverberg, 1987; Rogers and Amato, 2000) and relational variables, such as communication skills, social support and problem solving skills (Haynes et al., 1992). However, this study looked at how levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy are influenced by two relational variables, gender role attitudes and spousal support and how marital satisfaction and intimacy varied by two demographic variables, gender and age, in Botswana. Specifically, the study examined the contribution of gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender in predicting variation in levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy after adjusting for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income among married individuals in Botswana.

Rationale

A number of different reasons identified as contributing to the salience of marital satisfaction and intimacy in the research literature include: marital quality affects the

probability of divorce and separation (Spanier, 1976); the negative effects of marital discord and dissolution extend beyond the marital partners to those of the children as well (Bradbury, Fincham and Beach, 2000); the costs of marital distress can be seen not only within the physical health of the marital partners, but also in their mental health as well (Griffin, 1993); and marital discord and dissolution are prevalent and costly problems (Davila and Bradbury, 2001). Therefore, finding alternatives to what appear to be ineffective solutions to divorce and its outcomes on individuals, families and communities is imperative. The study is an important step in this direction especially within the context of the paucity of empirical information on marriages in Botswana.

Moreover, review of the literature suggests that marital satisfaction, intimacy, issues of divorce and separation may vary across cultures and ethnic groups (Jose & Alfons, 2007) and across race and social classes (Blair-Loy & DeHart, 2003). For example, a study on marital satisfaction in Pakistan among women revealed that the society and parents expect a married woman to endure marriage and to avoid divorce at all costs (divorce rate is 0.3 per 1000 but with high levels of dissatisfaction); arranged marriages, leaving women at the mercy of their husbands, the family being synonymous to womanhood and her needs being of less significance; and a wife can not express unhappiness, either to her husband or to his family. Many participants in the study felt helpless in their circumstances, though they desired egalitarian marriages (Qadir, De Silva, Prince & Khan, 2005). Across continental Europe, Hank and Jurges (2007), in their study of gender and the division of household labor, found considerable variation in the overall distribution of household labor. They believe that these differences are due to differences of gender ideologies in terms of egalitarian and traditional gender roles from

country to country in Europe (Hank & Jurges, 2007). However, a thorough search of the behavioral science literature yielded no similar studies of couples in Botswana, and a few in Africa as a whole, and in particular as it relates to marital satisfaction and intimacy in a single study.

Interestingly, the review of the literature reveals that urbanization and industrialization impact marital outcomes in more similar ways in developing countries as compared to highly developed countries in the West. For instance, studies on marital outcomes in Metropolitan Moscow (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004); urban China (Pimentel, 2006; Lu, 2006); gender ideologies in Taiwan (Xu & Lai, 2004) and working mothers in Netherlands (van Wel & Knijn, 2006) point out that wives experience poorer mental health and do more household labor than their husbands, just as in the Western countries. As such, this study contributes to the literature by testing theories and research findings derived from economically developed Western countries in a country that is economically and culturally different.

Conceptual Framework

Symbolic interaction theory was used as the theoretical framework to understand how individuals viewed their levels of satisfaction and intimacy in their marital relationships. The symbolic interaction theory is a relevant framework in this study for three main reasons. First, Burgess (1926) defines the family as a system of interacting personalities. Second, Berger and Luckman's (1966) belief that human interactions and their resulting definitions about the world are socially constructed. Third, the African context of living in community, kinship, immigrant population and urbanization (Mbiti, 1990) provides a unique environment for interactions and meanings among married people in Botswana.

Burgess (1926) developed the idea that a family is formed upon the interaction of its members rather than on its legal and formal contracts. According to LaRossa and Reitzes (1993), Burgess's understanding of the family unit denotes the fact that one's reaction or behavior has a way of influencing other family members' interactions and responses, hence the reference to interacting personalities. Symbolic interaction assumes that people act and respond to each other on the basis of the meanings that they have placed on each other's actions and on the basis of learned societal values and beliefs (LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993). In this study, attention is paid to the nature of the interactions between husbands and wives and how these interactions are interpreted in terms of satisfaction and intimacy in their relationships.

According to Mead (1922), much of human behavior is determined not by the objective facts of a situation, but by the meanings that people ascribe to it and the

subjective interpretations of reality impact and help influence human behavior. What people define as "reality" is actually a set of social constructs consisting of symbols that are assigned meaning and acted upon in accordance with these meanings. Overtime, these symbols become a language, and it is language that humans use to construct reality.

Symbols are defined as shared interpretations that produce common responses among individuals. Symbolic interaction examines language and habitual behaviors as they reflect the unspoken rules that govern how people are expected to act out in various social situations (Mead, 1934). In addition, as it comes to "meanings," human beings are said to respond toward things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them. One's thoughts, actions and feelings are significantly linked to the meaning attributed to extrinsic stimuli. That is, the meaning that a husband attributes to a wife (to a significant other) would determine an individual's thoughts, feelings and responses to the other. Meaning, therefore, comes into being during the process of interaction between people (LaRossa & Rietzes, 1993). These assumptions are relevant to this study as they suggest that levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy (meaning: what interaction means to married individuals), depend greatly on the interaction between husbands and wives and their interpretations.

Berger and Keller (1964) see marriage as a meaning-making enterprise in which two people come together and redefine themselves. Partners seek similarity and continually redefine reality as they correlate their definitions with one another. Further, Berger and Keller point out that symbolic interaction theory focuses on how individuals create shared social meanings, including roles and self-concepts that influence human behavior. The symbolic interaction theory looks at how people interact with each other in

a particular relationship (such as in marriage). Interactions are seen as reciprocal acts; everyday words and actions that take place between people. The words and actions/gestures are the symbols that are used to stand for something that gets interpreted and responded to by the other person. Human interactions therefore, according to Strong, DeVault and Sayad (1998), are in part structured according to social roles such as husband, wife, father, mother and child.

Interestingly, social norms are continuously evolving and symbolic interaction theory can be used to frame how married individuals change, or resist change, during periods of social upheaval (LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993). This theory is a particularly relevant perspective during this time of societal transitions regarding the roles of mothers and fathers and the divisions of paid and unpaid labor (White & Klein, 2002). For instance, symbolic interactionists hypothesize that the increased diversification of mothers and fathers, together with lack of societal consensus regarding role expectations, increases the potential of role strain. Therefore, it is not surprising that researchers have found that employed mothers and fathers with the lowest marital outcomes are those ambivalent about provider role attitudes (Helms-Erikson et al., 2000).

Symbolic interaction theory accounts for human behavior and family processes by also looking at the societal influences in terms of beliefs, expectations and norms. Some of the core issues that are addressed by the symbolic interactionists are: the roles or societal expectations for husbands and wives, or for fathers and mothers, and how these roles are constructed, learned and get played out, for instance, in a marital relationship (LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993). With these issues in mind, it is hoped that the results of this study will start a dialogue among married people of Botswana in regard to their values,

beliefs, norms, men and women's expected roles, challenges of adhering to these roles in a changing socio-economic environment. Additionally, it provides an opportunity for couples to consider the potential implications of their role orientation and perception of support in the socialization of their children given their beliefs and values. Specifically, this study teases out how married people in Botswana interact (make meaning) within their cultural and socio-economic contexts, how gender roles and spousal support are played out, and the extent to which married men and women differ in their views on their levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. The study takes into account the age differences in the creation of meaning around issues of marital satisfaction and intimacy among married individuals in Botswana and how gender role attitudes and spousal support predict marital satisfaction and intimacy in this population.

Further, the symbolic interaction theory gives context of the meaning that is created by individuals in a given culture and how individuals act out in, or become different from, their dominant social discourse (Goffman 1983). Therefore, in this study, symbolic interaction theory is appropriate in looking into how the married individuals in Botswana act out their marital roles in terms of gender role attitudes and spousal support and view their marital satisfaction and intimacy in the contexts of the patriarchal system, kinships, family and community support, industrial growth, migration, urbanization and of the general African world view. Using symbolic interaction theory to study marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana, an African country that is going through social and economic changes as people tend to live in towns and cities, helps highlight issues of gender role attitudes and spousal support among married men and women of different ages.

Review of the Literature

Marital Satisfaction

Although no single definition has been given for what constitutes marital dissatisfaction, the common element in the empirical literature is that of negativity within the relationship (Griffin, 1993). Negative attitudes and behaviors within the marital relationship are factors that commonly discriminate distressed from nondistressed relationships (Griffin, 1993). A distressed relationship is one in which negative features are salient and positive features are relatively absent, while nondistressed relationships are characterized by positive features being salient and negative features being relatively absent (Bradbury, Fincham & Beach, 2000). In addition, the factors that constitute marital distress may not simply be the opposite of the factors which lead to marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction is not defined in terms of the absence of dissatisfaction. Just as it is true that the opposite of love is not necessarily hate or anger, but indifference, the opposite of marital dissatisfaction is not necessarily marital satisfaction (Bradbury, Fincham & Beach, 2000).

According to Murray and others (2003), one of the greatest challenges to satisfying and sustaining romantic relationships is the emergence of negativity. From an attachment perspective, negative events, such as conflicts or harsh words from a spouse, tend to activate the prospect of rejection and loss and thus, the need to seek reassurance and comfort from an attachment figure. Crowell et al. (2002) add that if a couple has a secure attachment, then for every occasion that a partner reaches out or responds to the other partner, there is a tremendous advantage for the relationship. This advantage may

be seen over time, and with repeated experience, there will be a substantial difference in the quality of the couple's experience together.

Relationships in which attachment is absent are associated with marital dissatisfaction, poor communication, and poor support behavior within the marriage (Davila and Bradbury, 2001). Marital satisfaction has been found to be greater to the extent that the marital partners report secure versus avoidant or anxious ambivalent attachment styles (Bradbury et al., 2000). The importance of marital attachment is also seen in the need for belonging and a sense of acceptance. Like in a parent-child relationship, a romantic relationship is an adult context in which individuals are so dependent upon one another for the satisfaction of their needs (Murray, Bellavia, Rose & Griffin, 2003).

In addition, day-to-day experiences between couples accumulate in ways that shape the general expectations of their partners about the relationship and even about themselves (Murray et al., 2003). Spouses who are distressed expect their partners to exhibit fewer positive behaviors and more negative behaviors, and spouses who are nondistressed expect their partners to exhibit more positive behaviors and fewer negative behaviors (Fincham et al., 1995). Furthermore, longitudinal research has shown that factors such as distressed and nondistressed spouses predict discord, which in turn predicts dissolution, with dissatisfaction being the most proximal predictor of dissolution. The stability and marital satisfaction are seen as determined by the frequency of positive and negative behaviors exhibited by spouses (Davila, Karney & Bradbury, 1999).

Marital functioning is guided by spousal interactions, which also affect cognitive processing and schemas (Bradbury et al., 2000). Some social cognition scholars point out

that spousal interactions affect the coding of information into memory, and that coding affects retrieval of information from memory. Concepts that are easily retrieved from memory can have a pervasive impact on spousal information processing and judgments. When judgments are made, not all concepts are equally accessible or brought to mind with equal ease. Although marital satisfaction is readily accessible to all spouses, there may be individual differences in the accessibility of that information from memory due to negative marital interaction (Fincham et al., 1995).

Since marital interaction is defined in terms of overt behaviors (Griffin, 1993), behaviors that are seen as anger or contempt and humor or affection appear to have a robust effect on the marital satisfaction, as well as spousal appraisal of the interaction within the marriage (Johnson, 2002). Displays of anger or contempt are associated with ratings of lower marital satisfaction for couples, and displays of humor or affection are associated with ratings of higher marital satisfaction for couples (Johnson, 2002). It has been postulated that daily marital events are significant contributors to happiness within the marital context, and that daily marital behaviors correlate significantly with marital satisfaction or dissatisfaction, depending on whether the behaviors are positive or negative (Johnson and O’Leary, 1996).

Intimacy

In defining and describing intimacy, many researchers refer to “closeness” and “openness” in a marital relationship. For instance, Sternberg (1987) defines intimacy as those feelings in a relationship that promote being close, bonding and connected to each other. Weingarten (1992) conceptualizes intimacy as a quality of a particular interaction

occurring when people share meaning or co-create meaning and are able to coordinate their actions to reflect their mutual meaning-making. Waring (1988) posits intimacy as a continuum of relational facets measured by quantity, degree, and intensity of closeness and openness. The common features of the different definitions of intimacy are closeness, shared meaning and openness.

Hatfield (1988) suggests that intimacy involves a process in which people try to become close and explore their similarities and differences in feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. Schnarch (1991) adds that intimacy is the process of being in touch with or knowing oneself as well as the disclosure of self in the presence of a partner. Schaefer and Olson (1981) conceptualize intimacy as a process and an experience that is the outcome of the disclosure of intimate topics and sharing intimate experiences, and an intimate relationship as two people who share intimate experiences over time and who expect continuity of the relationship and those experiences.

Moreover, important components in the definitions of intimacy are described in the literature as: acceptance and naturalness (Goldhor-Lerner, 1989; Beck, 1988; Hatfield, 1988), sexuality (Schnarch, 1991; Malone & Malone, 1987), autonomy and fusion (Lichtenberg, 1991; Schnarch, 1991; McGoldrick, 1988), and intellectual, physical, and emotional closeness (Dahms, 1972). Mutuality also appears to be an essential ingredient of marital intimacy (Malone & Malone, 1987; Wynne & Wynne, 1986), especially when it refers to similarity of intimate experience (Kenny & Acitelli, 1994) and understanding (Beck, 1988) between spouses. Self-disclosure is making one known to the other person by verbally revealing personal information (Prager, 1995). Given the multiple ways in which intimacy is described and presented, this study,

however, examines the core elements of intimacy as described by Schaffer and Olson (1981), which are emotional, social, sexual, intellectual and recreational intimacy.

Gender Role Attitudes, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Gender role attitudes or gender ideology refers to how a person identifies herself or himself in terms of marital and family roles that are traditionally linked to gender. Specifically, these are what husbands and wives expect from each other and from themselves within their marital relationships (Greenstein, 1996). Gender role attitudes range between traditional and egalitarian. Those who hold onto the traditional view in marriage expect a wife to remain at home and to take care of the house, children and family while a husband is expected to work and be the “head of the household.” Egalitarians often share the view that husbands and wives are equal in all domains (Botkin, Weeks & Morris, 2000). For instance, those who hold traditional gender attitudes believe that “woman’s work” entails housecleaning, cooking and laundry while “man’s work” involves tasks such as yard work and auto maintenance (Greenstein, 1996).

The literature clearly supports the importance of equality in a marital relationship for higher levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. Johnson’s (2003) review of the effectiveness of couples’ therapy concluded that there is substantial research evidence documenting that gender stereotyped roles are bad for marital satisfaction and intimacy. Gottman and Silver (1999) state that equal sharing of power contributes to relationship success and satisfaction for both husbands and wives. Further, relationship equality provides an important foundation for couples who report success in balancing work and family life (Haddock, Zimmerman, Ziemba & Current, 2001) and is related to fewer

depressive symptoms and higher levels of emotional well-being and intimacy (Steil, 1997).

Although the feminist movement helped to increase the numbers of working women and shifts in gender role attitudes among both men and women, from traditionalism to egalitarianism, many working wives still do more domestic labor than their husbands (Bartley, Blanton & Gilliard, 2005; Coltrane, 2000). According to Amato and Booth (1995), as wives' attitudes became more egalitarian, their perceived marital quality goes down. In contrast, as husbands' attitudes became more egalitarian, their perceived marital quality goes up. One explanation may come from the finding that an ideology of marital equality does not necessarily translate into an outcome of marital equality (Blaisure & Allen, 1995). Along these lines, Hackel and Ruble (1992) found that violated support expectations (particularly division of childcare and household labor) were related to less marital satisfaction for wives. Additionally, egalitarian wives with an unequal division of household labor are likely to experience more discontentment than traditional wives do with an unequal division of labor (Buunk, Kluwer, Schuurman, & Siero, 2000).

Beyond the influence of gender itself, other existing studies suggest that housework allocation is associated with (a) individuals' attitudes about appropriate roles for women and men, (b) the time an individual has available to do housework, and (c) the couple members' relative resources (Coltrane, 2000; Shelton & John, 1996). Nevertheless, even when wives are involved in the labor market, scholars have observed that still women do more household work than men. While men are expected to hold egalitarian attitudes, be more involved in household work more equitably with their

partners, attitudes have been easier to change than behaviors (Coltrane, 1996). Men have shown a slight increase in the amounts of household work that they perform, but women continue to perform the bulk of the work (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer & Robinson, 2000; Pleck, 1985).

Although changes in gender ideology may not be as apparent among the late-life couples, studies have revealed that husbands with egalitarian attitudes have higher levels of marital satisfaction and are less likely to divorce (Kaufman & Taniguchi, 2006; Amato & Booth, 1995). Scholars believe that couples with egalitarian attitudes, among younger (Amato & Booth, 1995; Kaufman, 2000) and older (Kaufman & Taniguchi, 2006) couples, have higher levels of marital satisfaction than those with traditional attitudes. It seems that egalitarian attitudes are more important for marital quality when held by husbands than by wives (Vannoy & Philliber, 1992; Ferree, 1991). Blaisure and Allen (1995) argue that men must believe in equality for women to experience improvements and happiness in marital relationships.

Since the literature points out that most couples fall into unequal relationship patterns without their conscious intention or awareness (Ziemba & Rust, 2001; Knudson-Martin & Mahoney, 1998), the addition of gender role attitudes in this study helps to explain the different levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy among married individuals in Botswana.

Spousal Support, Marital satisfaction and Intimacy

Spousal support, like social support, is the help, advice, understanding, and the emotional support that spouses provide for one another to protect each other from the

effects of stress (Carlson & Lankau, 2001). Two forms of spousal support, the emotional and instrumental, have been conceptualized and empirically tested (Adams, King, & King, 1996). Emotional support includes emphatic understanding, listening, affirmation of affection, advice, and genuine concern for the welfare of the other spouse. Instrumental support is tangible help from the partner in terms of household chores and childcare (Aycan & Eskin, 2005).

Increased spousal support is shown to be associated with higher levels of psychological well-being (Ganster, Fusilier & Mayes, 1986), better marital adjustment (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992) and increased intimacy levels (Johnson, Hobfoll, Stevan & Zalcberg-Linetzy, 1993). Individuals who report higher rates of spousal support are more likely to report higher levels of marital satisfaction (Dehle et al., 2001). Instrumental spousal support eases the burden of family demands and enables spouses to devote more time to work, whereas emotional spousal support enhances feelings of self-efficacy both at home and at work (Parasuraman, Purohit & Godshalk, 1996).

In one study, a nationally representative sample of the North American adults examined the interaction of gender and gender role attitudes on spousal support and marital quality. Emotional spousal support predicted better marital satisfaction and less conflict for traditional women and egalitarian men, whereas both instrumental and emotional spousal support predicted better marital satisfaction for egalitarian women and traditional men. The researchers believe the results suggest that within, as well as between, gender differences are important for understanding the contribution of spousal support to perceived marital quality (Mickelson, Claffey & Williams, 2006).

Further, researchers on spousal support and marriage have found that spousal support is a significant predictor of both greater marital satisfaction (Acitelli & Antonucci, 1994) and lesser marital conflict (McGonagle, Kessler & Schilling, 1992), and more so for women than for men. Emotional support is thought to be more important for women's well-being because of women's emphasis on intimacy in relationships. The expectation for intimacy and caring may make emotional support salient in a wife's evaluation of marital quality (Acitelli, 1996). On the other hand, married men's marital satisfaction and intimacy may be strongly connected to both instrumental spousal support because of their socialized expectations for marriage and marital roles (Thompson, 1993) and emotional spousal support because the wives are often the sole confidant for married men (Belle, 1987).

The type of spousal support that is most beneficial to marital quality may vary depending on an individual's gender and his/her gender role attitudes. For instance, women with traditional gender role attitudes consider housework to be the woman's responsibility. As such, instrumental support from a husband would be less expected, and, therefore, should be less important than emotional spousal support for these wives' perceived marital quality. By contrast, women with egalitarian gender role attitudes consider housework a shared domain. As such, instrumental support from a husband would be greatly expected, and, therefore, it may be as important as emotional spousal support for these wives' perceived marital quality. For men, on the other hand, the opposite pattern may be found; traditional men expect more instrumental spousal support from their wives than egalitarian men do (Mickelson, Claffey & Williams, 2006).

In addition to examining gender role attitudes, this study examined the influence of spousal support on marital satisfaction and intimacy while controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Age, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Age and marital satisfaction. Differences in chronological age of married people have been identified as important predictors of the variations in levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. The literature uses various terms to refer to three age groups, or three developmental life cycles stages. These groups are: early marriage (Kurdek, 2005), or younger couples and early family life-cycle stage (Rexroat, 1985); middle-aged couples, middle family life-cycle stage (Yeh et al., 2006; Rexroat, 1985) and late-life couples, older couples, or older married adults (Hank & Jurges, 2007; O'Rourke, 2005).

The studies on marital satisfaction over the family life cycle have consistently suggested a curvilinear pattern, with the level of satisfaction at its lowest point during the middle stage, when the oldest child in the family is an adolescent (Anderson, Russell & Schumm, 1983; Menagham, 1983; Burr, 1970). Steinburg and Silverberg (1987) did a study to investigate why marital satisfaction goes down during the middle stage. Based on the results of their study, they contend that the diminished marital satisfaction during the middle stage may be due to changes in the division of housework, midlife identity issues, changes in partners' perceptions of marital quality, or changes and challenges that come along with parenting adolescents.

Although divorce rates are low and reports of high satisfaction are common among couples in later-life, they still face challenges and problems in their relationships.

These challenges are important to understand because marital problems have been linked to decreased physical health and increased depression (Fincham & Beach, 1999; Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). For example, Whisman and Bruce (1999) found that dissatisfaction in marriage is strongly related to having a major depressive episode. They report that spouses who are dissatisfied with their marriage are three times more likely to experience a major depressive episode than spouses who are satisfied. Among older couples, couples with low levels of marital satisfaction are at higher risk for depression (Sandberg & Harper, 2000).

Marital difficulties also place late-life couples at higher risk for physical health problems. In a major review of research on the impact of marriage on health, Kiecolt-Glaser and Newton (2001) found substantial evidence that marital dissatisfaction increases the risk of a number of health problems, including heart disease, as well as decreases in the level of overall health. Moreover, one study found that marital problems were associated with lower levels of health among mid-life and late-life couples (Levenson, Carstensen, & Gottman, 1993).

In general, older couples experience less relationship distress than younger couples and have less desire for their spouses to change (Rabin & Rahav, 1995). Yorgason and others (2006), in their study of health problems and marital satisfaction among late-life couples, men and women reported similar marital satisfaction and chronic illness severity. Also, late-life couples generally experience less conflict in their relationships (Levenson et al., 1993). However, older couples still face relational disagreements and adjustments (Miller, Hemaseth, & Nelson, 1997). One study that examined marital problems among late-life couples found that communication, recreation

and money were the three most common problem areas for late-life couples, which are also common problems among young and mid-life couples (Levenson et al., 1993).

Research suggests that some of the challenges and struggles that late-life couples face are different from those faced by younger couples (Miller et al., 2003). For example, there are unique aspects of older couples' experiences, such as retirement and health concerns, that are generally not issues among younger couples. Conversely, important issues common to younger couples, such as childrearing and in-law challenges, are generally not a concern to older couples (Levenson et al., 1993).

Age and intimacy. Some clinicians and theoreticians state that intimacy can be a core issue for couples during the first years of marriage (Monte, 1989; McGoldrick, 1988; Berman & Leif, 1975). On the other hand, Laumann and colleagues (1999) point out that intimacy issues in regards to sex are most common among young women and older men. Several factors may explain these differences: young women's relationship instability, coupled with inexperience, might generate stressful sexual encounters, providing the basis for sexual pain and anxiety, while the young men might not similarly be affected. Older men are more likely to have trouble maintaining an erection and to lack an interest in sex, possibly resulting from physiological changes associated with the aging process.

When it comes to late-life couples, one potential consequence of age-related declines in health and physical functioning is a decrease in emotional well-being among couples. As health declines, depression and negative affect tend to increase, whereas life satisfaction and positive affect tend to decrease (Meeks, Murrell, & Mehl, 2000). Also, findings suggest that men and women might continue with their gender roles and gender-

biased intimacy similar to those in their younger counterparts (Almeida & Kessler, 1998), wives doing more nurturing, spousal support than their husbands (Kramer & Kipnis, 1995). On the other hand, some wives and husbands tend to report similar levels of intimacy and marital satisfaction, as they share or are influenced by each other's health habits and having been together for years (Yorgason et al., 2006; Olser, 1998).

Gender, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Gender and marital satisfaction. The literature points out many different results and interpretations as to how gender, power and marital satisfaction play out among couples. First, some scholars (Yodanis, 2005; Zipp, Prohaska, & Bemiller, 2004; Eagly 1987) argue that gender is a social construct, man-made behavior, which we are socialized into. These researchers state that both men and women are socialized in different roles, beliefs and attitudes about what men and women ought to do or not do. The socialization moves from the larger society to families and children who carry these stereotypes into their marriages and their work places.

Lin and Raghubir (2005) argue that though both wives and husbands are optimistic about their marital happiness, women are more optimistic and tend to be less prepared (not thinking about divorce as a possibility) than men. In addition, Schulz, Cowan, Pape, and Brennan (2004) suggest that gender differences in marital satisfaction are enhanced under stress, such as after very stressful days at work. Under too much stress from work, women would tend to be angrier to their husbands and men would tend to be more withdrawn from their partners.

Biological theories state that men and women process events in their relationships differently at the cardiovascular, endocrinological, immunological, neurosensory, and neurophysiological levels. For instance, Kiecolt-Glaser and Newton (2001) reviewed evidence showing that while men are more physiologically sensitive than women to acute stressors, women show stronger and more durable physiological changes to marital conflict than men do. Simpson and Gangestad (2001) propose that men and women differ in areas in which they have to face life's challenges and choices. For example, in a meta-analysis of evidence regarding strategies used to attract a mate, Schmitt (2002) found that whereas appearance-related tactics were judged to be more effective for women than for men, resource-related tactics (demonstrating one's financial security) were judged to be more effective for men than for women.

Gender is, therefore, an important variable that needs to be examined when studying marital satisfaction. Some studies have found significant gender differences when examined within the context of marital satisfaction (Storaasli & Markman, 1990). For example, Miller and others (2003) found significant gender differences in six of the fourteen problem areas in their study of couples seeking therapy services. Likewise, Rabin and Rahav (1995) found that later-life wives were more likely than men to report areas that they would like to see changed in the relationship, such as in keeping the house clean, starting conversations, going out with relatives, help with housework, spending time with the children, having time for self, and husbands to express their feelings more. Older husbands reported that meeting with friends was the one area they would like to see change in their marriages.

Other studies have found only minor gender differences (Quirouette & Gold, 1992). For example, Levenson and others (1993) found a difference in rated severity of disagreements among husbands and wives only in one of the ten problem areas. When dissatisfied couples were examined, women reported higher levels of disagreement over money than did men. However, there were no gender differences among satisfied couples.

Gottman and Krokoff (1989) state that in distressed marriages wives most often complain that their husbands are withdrawn and husbands complain that their wives are too conflict engaging. In happy marriages husbands report themselves as being self-disclosing. Along with the decline in marital satisfaction, it appears that spouses may begin to show those behaviors that begin a downward spiral, that subsequently lead to divorce. For instance, emotional withdrawal patterns on the part of the husband lead to further dissatisfaction on the part of the wife, thereby resulting in increased levels in negative affect reciprocity by the wife, which in turn leads to decreased satisfaction on the part of the husband (Levenson & Gottman, 1985).

Expressed marital dissatisfaction is the strongest predictor of negative affect among distressed wives, and wives who are distressed have a tendency to engage in and stay in the negative state, as opposed to husbands, who appear to withdraw from the conflict. An explanation for this may be that husbands react mainly to the situation whereas wives react to the relationship as a whole. Negative affect reciprocity during marital interactions is shown to be the most potent discriminator of the quality of the marriage than any other variable by itself (Griffin, 1993).

Research indicates that wives are much more satisfied in marriages in which their husbands are more emotionally expressive (Campbell and Snow, 1992). In a study by Shapiro, Gottman and Carrère (2000), during transitions to parenthood, women rated their relationships to be more satisfying when their partners expressed more fondness toward the women, and when the women were aware of the efforts that their partners were making to show love and support during transitional periods in the relationship. In terms of both husbands and wives, those who attribute both partners with their partners' positive behavior show the most adjustment in marriage. However, this is not the case when attributions are made separately for the positive behaviors of the partner. The interpretation of this is that parties who are more adjusted attribute both of the partners as being responsible for the happiness in the marriage.

The literature suggests a curvilinear pattern of age on marital satisfaction with young couples experiencing higher levels of marital satisfaction, middle aged couples having lower marital satisfaction and older couples with higher levels of marital satisfaction. This study looked at how married men and women of different ages in Botswana, judged and made sense/interpreted of their marital experiences by looking at their levels of marital satisfaction in terms of four areas of marital satisfaction described by Spanier (1976), which are: dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and affectional expression.

Gender and Intimacy. The essentialist view of gender, that one can make assumptions about all men and women across generations and cultures, is certainly challenged by recently changing roles and the postmodern perspective that gender is a social construct. However, Gilligan (1982) argues that the sixth stage of Erikson's

psychosocial theory of development, "intimacy versus isolation" (Erikson, 1959), more accurately describes the development of men than the development of women. Power and separation secure men in an identity achieved through work, leaving them distant from others. Intimacy, for men, becomes the transforming experience that brings the self back into connection with others and to an understanding of their perspectives. Gilligan states that women's development is characterized by the fusion of identity and intimacy.

Most women, Gilligan (1982) notes, define their identity through the relationships of intimacy and care. Philpot and others (1997) in reviewing and comparing cross-cultural literature, observe an underlying foundation of gender socialization across cultures in which the pattern of male dominance and power and female nurturance and beauty appears. These scholars, while they acknowledge the overlap in male and female perceptions, emphasize that men and women develop and live in two separate cultures because of the gender messages they receive throughout a lifetime. These gender messages reinforce and reward different value systems, different personality characteristics, different communication styles, different problem-solving techniques, and different perspectives on sexuality and assign different roles and hold different expectations for intimate relationships. Men have functioned predominantly in the work sphere, which restricts close personal relationships and fosters increased selfishness and heightened distrust of others. Women have functioned within the domain of the home, which is sustained by the intimacy and emotional support of close relationships. These entrenched roles have powerfully influenced gender differences in defining and experiencing intimacy in the American culture (Philpot et al., 1997).

Cancian (1986) adds that women and men prefer different styles of love, which are consistent with their gender roles. While women tend to prefer emotional closeness and verbal expression they desire the emotional interdependence fostered by self-disclosure. Men tend to prefer giving instrumental help, doing activities together, and sex; they seek forms of love that permit them to deny their dependency on women. In harmony with these different styles of expressing intimacy, Cancian (1986) notes that men are often considered incapable of intimacy, whereas women are assumed to be more skilled at love and more in need of it.

Inman (1993) argues that research presents a non inclusive view of closeness that values women's preferences for verbal disclosures over men's preferences for instrumental activity. Therefore, according to Inman, the construct of intimacy has taken on the qualities associated with women's expression of intimacy, thereby "feminizing intimacy" and deepening gender differences in the experience and expression of intimate relations. Communication researchers focusing on gender differences (Wood & Inman, 1993; Lang-Takac & Osterweil, 1992; 1990) also indicate that men and women are different in their expression and experience of intimacy. For instance, Stahmann, Young, and Grover (2004) note that women are often portrayed as having the desire for emotional intimacy while men are portrayed as only having a desire for sexual intimacy.

Further, several scholars (Philpot et al., 1997; Coontz, 1992; Gadlin, Mintz & Kellogg, 1988) believe that economic and social status serve as a mold in shaping intimacy, providing and maintaining different limits for men's and women's experience of intimacy. Coontz (1992) suggests that living in separate spheres is related to the different ways men and women seek and experience love. For a woman, Coontz (1992, p. 62-63)

states that the process of falling in love is not so much a loss of control but “it is a socially acceptable way of exploring her own powers, challenging herself, finding the simultaneous transcendence and self-absorption that men find in work ... Emotions are women's work; the home is the place where most of that work takes place.”

On the other hand, Heller (1998) discovered that intimacy is based on both understanding and having similar intimate experience. Heller’s study examined gender and three aspects of marital intimacy using a method to establish both objective and subjective indices of intimacy: (1) subjective feelings of level of intimacy, (2) spousal similarity of experience of intimacy, and (3) accuracy in predicting how intimate their spouses feel (mutual understanding). The study also examined whether and how men and women differ in these patterns of intimate relating. Fifty couples answered the Personal Assessment of Intimate Relationships (Schaefer & Olson, 1981) twice: once as a self-report and once to respond as they predicted how their spouses would answer. The results revealed that couples who were less accurate in predicting each other's responses also reported lower levels of intimacy; women reported significantly higher levels of intimacy and were also better than men in predicting their partners' feelings.

Heller (1998) concludes that the findings suggest that women may be more attuned to intimacy or that the definitions and assessments of intimacy are gender biased or both. Also, the significant gender differences in levels of intimacy and accuracy of predicting partners' intimacy suggest that men and women may experience intimacy in different ways, that clinicians can help men and women become aware of the cultural roles and expectations about gender and how they influence their relationships and to appreciate their partner's style and preferences within the continuum of intimate relating.

Traditional gender roles have implicitly and explicitly shaped intimacy in marriage. Men and women may specialize in different domains of intimacy and leave to their partners the responsibility for doing the work in other domains of intimacy. For example, sexual initiation is an accepted male role, whereas women are the emotional feelers and talkers. Therefore, it is not surprising that men were as good as women in predicting their partners in terms of sexual intimacy.

In this study, intimacy is examined as defined by Schaffer and Olson (1981), as a process involving five major areas/types of intimacy: (1) Emotional intimacy – closeness created through sharing feelings; (2) social intimacy – having common friends and similarities in social networks; (3) intellectual intimacy – mutual understanding about issues, the experience of sharing ideas and goals; (4) sexual intimacy – the experience of sharing general affection and /or sexual activity, including sexual frequency that both spouses are satisfied with, sexual activities that both enjoy and an open dialogue about sex and (5) recreational intimacy – mutual participation in sports and shared interests in hobbies such as reading, watching a movie and cooking. Attention is given to how intimacy levels, differ by the age of the participants and how men and women scored differently on the five major areas of intimacy as stated by Schaffer and Olson.

Number of Children, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Some researchers (Orbuch, House, Mero & Webster, 1996) give two reasons for the U-shaped curve for wives' marital satisfaction. First, before children come into the marriage, there is less housework for the wives. When children come, they are more likely to add more work to the wives but not to the husbands. Second, at the later life and

retirement, couples remain alone, no longer depending on each other by reason of income or raising the children but by their love for each other, just as they started without kids.

Reduced work and parental responsibility in late-life explain much of the increase of the late-life marital satisfaction among couples. As couples mature, they turn to get less traditional and relate as equal partners and live more like friends, similar to the early years of marriage without children and extra household duties for the wives (Orbuch, House, Mero & Webster, 1996). Kurdek (2005) adds to this by saying that what counts for marital satisfaction and marital stability for both young and old couples is the same for husbands and wives; there is no gender difference in attitudes to household labor and what constitutes marital satisfaction.

In addition to work and family schedules for working parents, children, especially the younger ones, tend to increase time pressure for the parents. However, women are said to be far more under time pressure than men, even if both are employed (Roxburgh, 2002). This difference of availability of time between wives and husbands is due to the fact that the division of household duties and child-care needs are gender-biased, wives do most of the work and nurture both kids and their fathers (Belsky, 1990). According to Roxburgh (2006), for instance, most men and women in her study said they would like to have more time with their spouses and children. Women are more likely to want more quality time whereas men are somewhat more likely to want more time with their spouses and children.

Lack of enough time, according to Kelly and Barnard (2000), raises questions of having enough time and energy to build secure attachment between the parents and the infants. In addition, other scholars (Matjasko & Feldman, 2006) wonder if couples with

infants or toddlers ever have enough time and energy for each other, for their marital relationship. However, some scholars (Guttmann & Lazar, 2004) have found out that though marital satisfaction for most couples would go down with the presence of children due to overwork and time constraints, couples with children tend to have higher levels of marital satisfaction than their childless counterparts.

Demo and Cox (2000), from their review of research of the 1990s, discovered that fathers' involvement in child-care determined marital satisfaction for both wives and husbands in nine months after the first child's birth. Some scholars (Bumbs et al., 1999; Kalmin, 1999) have revealed that one reason for father's participation in child-care and household activities would be determined by the presence of a son or sons in the household. On average, a father would invest more in sons than in daughters, have closer ties to his son(s) and hence have more to lose through divorce. In this instance, Jansen and Liefbroer (2006) observe that at other times wives could hinder their husbands' input in child-care and household duties by not letting them do whatever they feel like doing, maternal gatekeeping.

Overall, involved fathers are found to have stable marriages, their wives decrease their time in child-care and household activities, and both husbands and wives gain some time for each other and children. In such marital relationships, children are seen as the "investment" that increases marital security, with lesser chances of divorce than childless couples. Therefore, the presence of children becomes the "marital capital" that helps in marital satisfaction and long-term commitment (Kalmin, 1999).

According to Orbuch, House, Mero and Webster (1996), the presence of children brings more work in the household, which is mostly done by wives. This, in most cases,

could mean either fewer hours at their paid work, two jobs, or a balance between the two jobs for some wives. The presence and absence of children in a marriage relationship explains the marital satisfaction of wives more than that of the husbands. According to Mennino and Brayfield (2002), this would mean that wives, due to socialization into gender roles, would be put in positions of sacrifices, adjustments and compromises between the paid job and domestic labor.

However, two other studies (Allen & Webster, 2001; Marks et al., 2001) point out that with the presence of pre-school age and elementary kids, household labor is in many times shared between husbands and wives. At these ages, it is reported that both mother and father get involved, attached to the children and that children usually come when marital satisfaction is still high for both spouses.

As the children begin to grow, gender differences between the mothers and fathers begin to surface. For mothers, their roles balance whenever they have more paid work hours but fewer of these hours on weekends and fewer household duties during the week. They need time with the family, separate times with the father as a couple without children and different times with the children and other relatives. Wives feel more relieved whenever they go out and leave the children with the husbands (Allen & Webster, 2001; Marks et al., 2001).

As for husbands, they contribute to wives' role balance when they report more relationship maintenance in the marriage and more leisure time with kids in the absence of their wives. The husbands' role balance increases as their income rises, but decreases as their paid work hours rise. Also, they experience role balance whenever they are with

more members of the nuclear family as compared to times when alone (Allen & Webster, 2001; Marks et al., 2001).

Overall, family researchers have identified the transition to parenthood as one of the most challenging family transitions (Belsky & Rovine, 1990; Huston & Holmes, 2004; Kurdek, 1999; Michaels & Goldberg, 1988). Among the most consistent findings is that the transition to parenthood is generally associated with a decline in marital satisfaction for both wives and husbands (Cowan & Cowan, 2000; Campbell & Foster, 2003). A primary reason for declining satisfaction is that couples sense themselves going in different directions; the division of household labor becomes more traditional, in that men focus more on the challenges of providing economic support and women focus more on domestic life and nurturing (Cowan & Cowan, 2000).

In addition, often times parenting comes with less pleasure and rejuvenation from a couple's time together (Belsky, Lang, & Rovine, 1985; Crawford & Huston, 1993); decline in sexual relation and romance (Belsky, Spanier & Rovine, 1983); change in the social systems (Box, Cox, Burchinal & Payne, 2002); wife's possible career change (Barkey, 1993); economic pressure that leaves parents frustrated and concerned about their family's financial ability to raise the child (Cowan & Cowan, 1992; Hinkley, 1986) and idealistic expectations come face to face with the realities of limited time and energy (Fowers, 2000). Parental stress has negative effects on mental health and marital satisfaction, across time and gender (Lu, 2006; Whiffen, Kerr & Kallos-Lilly, 2005).

However, research shows that spousal support for wives, investing in multiple roles can be an important factor in their experience of distress. Husbands can help their wives through child care, household chores, emotional support and availability in a crisis

(Thorstad et al., 2006). Furthermore, egalitarian gender role attitudes of women and men have been shown to lead to an increasing contribution of men to household and nurturing tasks (Jansen & Kalmijn, 2002). In addition, other types of attitudes, such as positive parenthood attitudes also have been reported to influence family behaviors (Beets, Liefbroer, & De Jong Gierveld, 1999).

When it comes to the transition to parenthood, studies state that this transition comes with added household duties that could impact men's and women's marital satisfaction and intimacy differently. In addition, different couples at various stages of the life cycles would experience the transition to parenthood differently, resulting in different levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, according to age and gender. Overall, the transition to parenthood, having children or not, seems to negatively affect women's levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy more than men's. In this study, adding number of children as a controlled variable helps to explain the different levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, by age and gender, and how gender role attitudes and spousal support predict marital satisfaction and intimacy, among the participants of this study.

Religion, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Research in the past years routinely finds a positive association between a couple's religious beliefs and behaviors and the quality of their marriage. For instance, one early study (Burchinal & Lee, 1957) and a current study (Curtis & Ellison, 2002) reach the same conclusion: there is a strong and positive association between religion and marital quality. Interestingly, interfaith marriages, throughout the past decades, have been found to be less stable than same-faith marriages and may be more likely to end in

divorce (Lehrer & Chiswick, 1993; Bahr, 1981; Christensen & Barber, 1967; Vernon, 1960) while religious homogamy appears to be one of the stronger religious predictor of marital quality (Curtis & Ellison, 2002; Heaton & Pratt, 1990). According to Amato and Booth (2001) and Christiano (2000), the explanation for this long-term and contemporary phenomenon partly lies in the intergenerational transmission of religion and marital behaviors and the fluid reciprocity between the religious and family institutions. These studies suggest that children inherit their parents' levels of religion and marital quality and then replicate the positive link between religion and marital quality.

Sager and Hunt (1979) and Schneider (1989) believe that religion, like culture, is one source of common bonding, or congruence, between marital partners. These scholars point out that religion and culture come with ethnic values and mores in which couples “speak the same language.” In these domains of religion and culture shared heritages serve as a useful resource and frame of reference for negotiating differences and providing a strong foundation for marriage. Intramarried couples, also referred to as religious homogamy (Grossman, 2002; Heaton & Pratt, 1990), may experience greater intimacy because their common religious backgrounds provide a “language” for communicating and negotiating their differences with less conflict.

In addition, Crohn (1995) says the disapproval by families and friends of one's spouse's religious affiliation might pose some additional challenges for the couple. Therefore, as Kalmijn & Bernasco (2001) point out, interfaith spouses are more likely to lead separate lifestyles, such as maintaining different patterns of social contacts with parents, siblings, friends and neighbors. In other studies, interfaith partners reported more difficulties in religious identity development (Clamar, 1991; Sousa, 1995), in religious

socialization of children (Judd, 1990; Williams & Lawler, 2000), and in performance of religious-based holiday rituals (Horowitz, 1999).

Scholars who have looked into how faith and spirituality play out among religious couples conclude: faith and spirituality support commitment and life-long marriages through crises and celebrations, facilitate unity and differentiation (Giblin, 1997); consistent faith sees the needs of others as more important than their own, and this selfless attitude is a good preparation for a healthy attitude of “give and take” in their marriage relationships (Anthony, 1993); that those who get married within their denomination tend to be more satisfied as compared to those who marry non-members (Dudley & Kosinski, Jr., 1990) and that religion and the practice of a couples’ beliefs (church attendance, being involved in religions activities and family worship) can enhance social support and network or destroy a spouse’ social network (Fiese & Tomcho, 2001) and being aware that having similar religious believes and social networks are said to be part of what intimacy is all about (Schaffer and Olson, 1981).

Regular church attendance is the greatest determinant of marital stability within the realm of religiosity. Couples who attend church regularly show the lowest risk of divorce, with the risk of dissolution increasing among those couples with spousal differences in church attendance. Marital stability is more heavily influenced by the wife’s beliefs regarding marital commitment, as well as her beliefs regarding no extramarital sex from a religious standpoint than are the husband’s beliefs regarding the same (Call & Heaton, 1997). While the literature points out that religion may impact marital satisfaction and intimacy, in this study the influence of gender role attitudes and

spousal support, the differences by age and gender, on marital satisfaction and intimacy are examined while controlling for religion.

Occupation, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

The literature points out many different results and interpretations regarding how gender, power and marital satisfaction play out among employed and unemployed spouses. Rogers and Amato (2000) discuss employment status in terms of gender attitudes in terms of expected roles for men and women and power relationships. Traditional attitudes focus primarily on men as primary wage earners and women as homemakers, with a corresponding differential in power. Egalitarian, or nontraditional attitudes, focus on sharing economic and caring tasks and dividing power more equally between men and women. In addition, the literature discusses employment status in terms of women's employment (Spitze, 1981), dual-earner couples (Barnett, Marshall, Raudenbush & Brennan, 2006), men and women's retirement and later life (Kaufman & Taniguchi, 2006) and how these changes impact marital satisfaction.

Further, Mennino and Brayfield (2002) point out that the more a couple is socialized and believes the traditional gender roles, the more the wife would likely refuse promotion at work and work fewer hours than the husband and the more the husband would take extra hours at work and feel to be the primary wage earner. This assumption is supported by Mennino and Brayfield (2002) who point out that when it comes to trade-offs (compromises, sacrifices, adjustments, or accommodations), women are more likely than men to adjust hours at work for the sake of the sick family members or household

duties that need to be done. They point out that women are more likely than men to want to take care of the sick and to balance their hours at work with hours at home.

For example, in the study conducted by Zipp, Prohaska, & Bemiller (2004) husbands and their wives were interviewed separately. Each spouse first listened to the tape of his/her partner's responses and then was interviewed. Wives agreed with their husbands while husbands did not agree with their wives. Husbands and wives agreed that men's traditional domains were in politics, money and finances while women's domains were in the family and household duties, thus making gender differences among themselves (Zipp, Prohaska, & Bemiller, 2004).

In one study, Yodanis (2005) looked at the attitudes of husbands and wives across twenty-two countries regarding divorce and traditional domains assigned to men and women. He found out that though countries differed in their history, religion, family laws and the status of women there was no large variation in attitude toward divorce and societal expectations regarding the roles of men and women in marriage relationships. Men were expected to work, to be the main wage earners, while women were expected to be responsible for the kids and household duties. In addressing the different traditional domains assigned to men and women, that men were meant to work and women were to take care of domestic affairs, Yodanis (2005) argues that women's employment is a product of the widespread divorce culture. This author argues that since divorce has become common, leaving many women in financial need and suffering with their children, women are now increasingly joining men in the workplace to prepare for their unknown future, for divorce or separation. According to this study (Yodanis, 2005), men and women get involved in the career world for different reasons, for men as a natural or

socially determined/accepted role to be fulfilled while for women as a matter of adaptation and preparation in case of divorce.

A longitudinal research study with married women in the 1970s revealed that wives who subsequently divorced increased their work hours three years before marital separation (Johnson & Skinner, 1986). These authors interpreted their findings as indicating that wives were attempting to increase their economic independence and to prepare for divorce. Another longitudinal analysis by Rogers (1999) indicated that wives increased their income in response to increased marital discord and that entering the labor force was the most common means by which this was accomplished. Rogers concluded that wives' employment may be sensitive to husbands' perceived marital quality as well as their own, as wives may increase their level of employment in preparation for a divorce initiated by their husbands.

Barnett, Marshall, Raudenbush and Brennan (2006) believe that there are no gender differences in regard to the impact of full-time work among dual-earner couples. After studying 300 full-time employed dual-earner couples, these scholars came to the conclusion that full-time hours at work make no difference on the mental health, marital satisfaction, among married men and women across the ages. The conclusion of these scholars is that both wives and husbands get the same feelings of satisfaction from their jobs and this also impacts them the same way after work when they get home.

In addition, Lin and Raghubir (2005) argue that though both wives and husbands are optimistic about their marital happiness, women are more optimistic and tend to be less prepared (not thinking about divorce as a possibility) than men. They contend that women join the workforce for satisfaction and fulfillment just like men do, without

thinking about a possible divorce, instead of supporting the divorce. Schulz, Cowan, Pape, and Brennan (2004) also state that the impact of work on marital satisfaction and happiness for men and women is the same but gender differences are enhanced under stress, whenever there are very stressful days at work. Under too much stress from work, women tend to be angrier to their husbands and men tend to be more withdrawn from their partners.

Researchers have found that employed women spend less time on housework than do women who are not employed (Berk, 1985; Shelton, 1991). As a result, the husbands of employed women were found to perform a greater proportion of routine house chores (Pleck, 1985). In a recent study, Cunningham (2007) looked at the influence of women's employment on family functioning, and he also found that the husbands of women who accumulated more employment experience over the course of marriage performed a relatively larger amount of household work than the husbands of women with shorter employment histories. Cunningham concludes that wives' employment status at a given point in time also increases husbands' relative participation in routine housework and in part increases women's support for egalitarian roles between spouses.

Generally, some scholars associate wives' employment with their marital satisfaction, financial situation, or personal well-being (Rogers and DeBoer, 2001; Spitze, 1988). Wives' employment and income are also associated with greater marital power (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983), more equal sharing of child care and household work (Coltrane, 1996), and greater companionship between spouses (Hood, 1983) and help stabilizing marriages by increasing spousal interdependence (Schoen, Rogers & Amato, 2006).

Evidence from first marriages and remarriages indicates that women's education, actual earnings, and earning potentials are positively related to the likelihood that they will marry (Qian & Preston, 1993). A study of long-term changes in mate selection criteria and preferences revealed that women's actual or expected economic resources have become increasingly important in determining their desirability as marriage partners (Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001). Women with a lower education tend to do more household labor because they undertake less paid work, and the care culture is more important to them (Wel & Knijin, 2006).

When it comes to employment status, the literature seems to point out more of the effects of wives' employment status on marital satisfaction and intimacy than of husbands' employment. Employed wives seem to work less at home, resulting in higher levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy than non-employed wives. In this study, as occupation is added as a covariate variable, and it is observed if gender role attitudes and spousal support continue to make a significant difference on marital satisfaction and intimacy and if there are any significant age and gender differences on levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy.

Education, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

It is understood that individual resources include attributes individuals bring to the marriage that are indicative of their ability to successfully maintain a marital relationship. Some of these attributes are a person's educational level, emotional health and physical health and are individual resources that can signify a person's preparedness for marriage. Educated persons are believed to be more emotionally secure and to have

greater communication skills, making them better prepared for establishing functional marital relationships (Quinn & Odell, 1998). Similarly, it is believed that persons are better equipped to handle the marital challenges when they are emotionally healthy. For example, it has been shown that wives without depressive symptoms rate their relationships more positively and perceive themselves as more socially competent than those with depressive symptoms (Daley & Hammen, 2002).

One vehicle for remedying marital stress, occupational stress and for facilitating career fulfillment is through advanced formal education. Couples with higher socioeconomic status (SES), whether measured by income or educational level, are at less risk of marital disruption than couples with lower SES (White, 1990). Marriages between persons who differ in significant background characteristics, such as educational level, age and race, are also found to be at higher risk of marital disruption (Schoen & Wooldredge, 1989). Many of these significant background characteristics (e.g. educational level, age and general health) are related to women's labor force participation. The principal predictors of wives joining the labor market are the wife's educational level, husband's income, length of marriage, race and the presence of dependent children (Rogers, 1999; Spitze, 1988).

In a postmodern society, career and academic fulfillment are not only expressions of individual identity but also some determining factor in the family's economic health and security (Fox & Bartholomae, 2000; Young & Long, 1998). However, any transition by one family member, such as undertaking graduate study, confronts the marital and family systems with a need to rebalance, redefine, and realign their relationships (Carter

& McGoldrick, 2005). From this perspective, continuing education becomes a family task rather than an individual endeavor (Brannock, Litten, & Smith, 2000).

This transition of one member to pursue education entails a realignment of marital and family priorities such as time, energy, commitment, and financial resources (Gerstein & Russell, 1990; McLaughlin, 1985; Sori, Wetchler, Ray, & Niedner, 1996). At times, these processes may serve to strengthen the family unit, as all members are involved in the striving and success of the student. Conversely, this undertaking may threaten the stability and satisfaction of the marital and family unit as the student may be perceived as abandoning the marriage or family for the sake of his or her educational dreams (Norton, Thomas, Morgan, Tilley, & Dickens, 1998; Pearlin & Turner, 1987; Scheinkman, 1988).

Marriage and school, especially graduate study, seem not to work very well together; there is disruptive impact of graduate study on marital health and the reciprocal impact of marital dysfunction on graduate school hindering continuation and success. Hagedorn (1999) identified “family issues” as an impediment to graduate school success for aspiring women. Specifically, conflicts in the expectations between the roles of wife or mother and the role of student, plus an inability to resolve differences regarding family financial priorities, were seen to interfere with the women’s abilities to succeed in their graduate studies.

Moreover, MacLean and Peters’s (1995) and Legako and Sorenson’s (2000) samples reported that graduate studies placed heavy emotional and financial stresses on their marital relationships. Katz, Monnier, Libet, Shaw, and Beach (2000) found that their sample of married medical students were anxious about finances, time together with spouses, and lack of intimacy. These researchers established a significant relationship

between anxiety concerning those marital dynamics and students' reports of depression, with the levels of depression found to be negatively predictive of levels of academic functioning. Interestingly, Brannock and others (2000) found that spouses who were both graduate students reported significantly greater marital satisfaction than did spouses where only one spouse was in school.

Some researchers (Cherlin, 1979; Janssen, Poortman, De Graaf, and Kalmijn, 1998; Kalmijn, 1999) consistently state that highly educated women have a higher rate of unstable marriages. Others have found out that the "care culture" dominates more among mothers with lower education levels, with the consequence that they work less than mothers with higher education. Therefore, women with lower education do more in the household because they undertake less paid work than their husbands (Van Wel & Knijin, 2006).

The literature associates higher levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy to higher levels of education and lower levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy to the less educated and to those still in school. Therefore, in this study, the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support, and the different levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, by age and gender, on marital satisfaction and intimacy are observed while controlling for education.

Length of Marriage, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

There are some inconsistent findings by researchers on studies with regard to the number of years of marriage and marital satisfaction. As early as 1970, Rollins and Feldman reported that marital satisfaction follows a curvilinear path, declining from high

levels of marital satisfaction in the early years of marriage and then returning to nearly newlywed levels in later years. The existence of lower levels of marital satisfaction in the middle early years of marriage was then later reported by scholars such as Gilford and Bengtson (1979), Hudson and Murphy (1980), Rhyne (1981), Anderson, Russell, and Schumm (1983) and Schumm and Bugaighis (1986). These studies have reported marital happiness and adjustment levels to be higher among couples in later stages of life than among those in the middle stages.

In a study by Levenson, Carstensen, Laura and Gottman (1993), the findings supported a positive view of marriage in later stages of life. Compared with middle-aged marriages, older couples evidenced: (1) reduced potential for conflict and greater potential for pleasure in several areas such as children, (2) higher levels of overall mental and physical health, and (3) lesser gender differences in sources of pleasure. In this study, the relationship between marital satisfaction and health was stronger for women than for men. In satisfied marriages, wives' and husbands' health was similar; in dissatisfied marriages, wives reported more mental and physical health problems than did their husbands.

Overall, when it comes to old age, married individuals have better health and well-being than their single counterparts (Goldman, Korenman, & Weinstein, 1995; Laumann, Paik, & Rosen, 1999). Long-term marriages have the advantage of building secure attachment figures, and as time passes, with repeated positive experiences, there would be a substantial difference in the quality of the couple's experience together (Crowell et al., 2002).

On the other hand, a study by Vandervorst (2000), testifies to a gradual decline of marital satisfaction among married couples as the years pass. Interestingly, though Jose and Alfons (2007) agree with Vandervorst, that marital satisfaction declines as time passes, they state that there is high significant positive correlation between duration of marriage with sexual adjustment problems as time passes. Indeed, relationships of a long-term nature have been recognized as important sources of sexual fulfillment (Jerrome, 1993). There is a sense of comfort and ease that characterizes long-term marriages and this sense of ease and comfort extends to the sexual relationship (Huyck, 1977). Neugebauer-Visano (1995) found that the sexual experiences of long-term couples improved as time passes and that the love and affection that partners hold toward each other also become stronger.

Using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from the National Survey of Families and Households, Hatch and Bulcroft (2004) examined the frequency of marital disagreements concerning household tasks, money, sex, and time together reported by married women and men age 20 to 79. The results indicate that increased marital duration may bring increased marital disagreements, depending on family life course stage (particularly, the presence of children), and also depending on the spouses' ages and birth cohorts. The study suggests that couples who disagree more frequently are more likely to divorce or separate, particularly respondents of younger ages/birth cohorts, who have been married for relatively briefer periods of time. Marital happiness typically declines as the duration of marriage increases, whereas marital stability typically rises; couples may not necessarily be happy but well adjusted in their relationships (Glenn, 1990). Adding marital duration as a controlled variable in this study, therefore, helps to highlight the

influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support and the differences between men and women across age groups when it comes to levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana.

Household Income, Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy

Storaasli and Markman (1990) contend that the highest ranked problems before marriage are money, friends, and in-laws, whereas money, communication, and sex become the highest ranked problems early into marriage and continue to be the top-rated problem areas for couples. Stanley, Markman and Whitton (2002), also believe that money is the number one most commonly reported argument starter for couples, followed closely by children.

Money is a reality, a needed currency for couples to fulfill their life dreams, but it is also a metaphorical currency for power, control, acknowledgment, self-worth, competence, caring, security, commitment, and feeling loved and accepted (Shapiro, 2007). Family finances are an ever-present reality that no adult can ignore and are clearly an issue that can cause great distress for couples throughout their lifespan (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Barth, 2001). Money may cause anxiety because it is tied to feelings of marital and individual success, competence, safety, security, and acceptance in our society (Stanley & Einhorn, 2007).

For example, from their study, Stanley and Einhorn (2007) discovered that older wives and husbands reported less frequent marital disagreements in the areas of money, sex, household tasks, and spending time together. The descriptive results from their cross-sectional data show that, regardless of the duration of their marriages, older

respondents age 60 to 79 reported fewer disagreements with their spouses than did younger and midlife respondents. Their conclusions are: emotions and conflicts about money are filtered through the lens of social class, culture, race, and gender and that conflicts about money can be used as a therapeutic tool with couples to access their emotions and alter behavior.

Further, studies show that during times of financial stress, financial hardship or conflicts, couples are more likely to face marital instability, distress, poor marital quality and connection through the mediating effects of the stress on how partners treat each other (Conger & Elder, 1994); couples become more negative to each other (Story & Bradbury, 2004). In the case of poverty, lower income couples, or couples who are not experiencing extreme hardship but who nevertheless perceive their income as insufficient to meet their obligations, the actual stressors are extreme and impact the marriage by making it harder to regulate emotions and to support each other emotionally (Stanley & Einhorn, 2007). Interestingly, while financial issues are a common problem for all couples, younger couples are more likely to have more disagreements over spending money (Amato & Rogers, 1997) while late-life couples are more likely to have limited income, with the expectation that they will continue to provide financial assistance to their adult children and grandchildren who might have financial needs (Stone, Rosenthal & Connidis, 1998).

Lack of money or insufficient funds are found to be a potential source of disagreements among couples, both young and old, resulting in lower levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. This study examines the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support on marital satisfaction and intimacy while controlling for household

income. Also, controlling for household income in this study helps to verify how significantly different are men and women, across the age groups of married individuals in Botswana, in terms of marital satisfaction and intimacy.

A thorough review of the behavioral science literature yielded few studies dealing with marital satisfaction and intimacy in Africa as a whole, and no studies in Botswana. The few studies that were done in Africa regarding marital satisfaction and intimacy are recent and were carried out primarily in Ghana (Miller & Kannae, 1999); South Africa (Greeff & DeBruyne, 2000; Greeff & Malherbe, 2001) and Mauritius (Bhowon, Ngtseung & Kaajal, 2008). The findings of the studies carried out in these African countries and in developed and developing countries around the world suggest that (1) there will be age and gender differences in levels marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana and (2) the same levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy according to age and gender that are reported for some of the countries in this literature review. Specifically, the review of the literature reveals that urbanization and industrialization (the current experience in Botswana) impact marital outcomes in more similar ways in developing countries as compared to highly developed countries. For example, studies on marital outcomes in Metropolitan Moscow (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004); China (Pimentel, 2006; Lu, 2006); Taiwan (Xu & Lai, 2004) and in Netherlands (van Wel & Knijn, 2006) point out that wives experience poorer mental health and do more household labor than their husbands, just as in the Western countries.

This study has the potential to make a unique contribution to the behavioral science literature by filling a very important gap. The study specifically examines the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support and the different levels of marital

satisfaction and intimacy by age and gender, in Botswana, after controlling for number of children living at home, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. This study not only highlights the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support and the age and gender differences regarding marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana but also the need to further examine the influence of number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income in Botswana and other African countries too.

Methods

Participants

This quantitative, explorative and descriptive study was carried out in Gaborone, the capital city of the Republic of Botswana. This was a cross-sectional study, employing a self-administered survey and a paper-pencil survey methodology as the medium for data collection. Data were collected from March to September of 2009. The purpose of the study was to examine how marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana varied by gender and age and the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support on marital satisfaction and intimacy after considering the contribution of important covariates such as number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

The respondents in this study are individuals who were currently married and residing in Gaborone at the time of the study. A convenient sample was recruited from households which had married individuals who were willing to participate in the study. In each household selected, both husband and wife were given the questionnaire if both were available and consented to participate in the study. This study excluded visiting friends and relatives and spouses of participants who were not around during the survey.

The total number of surveys collected was 345. Of the 345 who responded, 278 were individual who were married, without their spouse's participation, and 62 were couples. From the 31 couples, probability sampling resulted in 16 married women and 15 married men being added to the sample of 278 individuals. Thus, the final sample used in this study consists of married individuals without their spouses. Also, six of the 345

respondents were dropped from the total number of the respondents because these filled in only the first pages of the questionnaires. The total number of respondents after dropping 31 spouses and six individuals who did not completely fill in the surveys was 309 married individuals. Of the 309 respondents, there are 56 percent women and 44 percent men. The age range of the sample is from 22 to 66 years old, mean being 39 and the length/duration of their marriages ranges from one year to 40 years, with a mean of 10.

Method of Data Collection

The Republic of Botswana, Ministry of Labour and Home affairs, was contacted and the research team was granted permission to conduct the study in Gaborone. The department of government statistics of Botswana assisted in providing information about households in Gaborone. According to the 2001 government census, there are 478 EAs (clusters of households) in Gaborone, and about 60 000 households in Gaborone (Government, 2001).

Ten college students, with a team-leader, helped in the process of data collection. The eleven individuals were trained through telephone conference and were provided with transportation to visit with potential subjects. The team members were assigned different EAs (clusters of households) to visit. Efforts were made to include both spouses and to include respondents from different socio-economic backgrounds, from different EAs in Gaborone. The potential subjects were solicited by asking married individuals, or couples, if they were willing to participate in the study on married people's views on marital relationships. During the initial contact, the study was introduced; the potential

subjects were presented with the cover letter of explanations of the study and the position of the subjects, the non-inclusion of identifying information, consent forms and choice to stop at any time. Subjects were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and would not be shared with their spouses and that their names and identifying information would not be attached to their responses. Wherever there were married people and they consented to participate in the study, team-members left questionnaires, to be collected the following week.

The survey instrument was presented in English and Setswana, as appropriate for each respective subject. The instrument was translated using standard principles to ensure accuracy such as back-to-back translation of the questionnaire. That is, questions in English were translated into Setswana and back into English. Three individuals, independently, translated the English version of the questions into Setswana and then three other individuals translated the Setswana version back into English. After each translation, the translating team met to account for the differences in the wording and understating of the questions. The feedback from the translators helped in adjusting the wording of the questions to be understood by the people residing in Gaborone.

Variables and Measurements

This study used well-known and well-established measurements to examine marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana. Specifically, the measurements of marital satisfaction and intimacy that were used in this study have not only been used in American and European studies but in other parts of the world, including the few studies in Africa.

Dependent variables. There are two dependent variables in this study. The first dependent variable is marital satisfaction, which was measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Spanier, 1976). The DAS has been widely used in the family sciences field and a number of studies have been conducted to empirically validate the scale and its effectiveness over the past 30 years. This is a 32-item scale that assesses for the quality of marriage (or cohabiting couples) according to the individual respondent's self-report. The DAS has four subscales, which are mostly used to determine a dyadic or couple adjustment either for research or clinical purposes. The four subscales are: Dyadic Satisfaction (10 items), Dyadic Cohesion (5 items), Dyadic Consensus (13 items), and Affectional Expression (4 items). In this scale, the participants were asked to rate how often they agreed or disagreed with their spouse with respect to specific items, the frequency of particular behaviors, the degree of happiness in their relationship and their feelings about the future of their relationship. Some of the items of the DAS, for instance, ask for: "Demonstration of affection. Household tasks. Sex relations. Do you ever regret that you married your spouse? Making major decisions," and others (see Appendix G).

The alpha coefficient for the total instrument (DAS) is reported as .96 (Spanier, 1976). Spanier (1976) reports evidence suggesting content, criterion-related and construct validity of the scale. The instrument yields an overall satisfaction/adjustment score as well as independent scores for each of the four subscales. In this study, the questions have five possible answers ranging from 1 (Always Agree) to 5 (Never Agree), or a frequency scale ranging from 1 (All the Time) to 5 (Never). The range of the overall marital satisfaction score is 32 to 154. A higher score indicates better reported marital quality. The ranges of the scores of the four subscales of marital satisfaction are: Dyadic

Satisfaction (10 items), 10 to 50, Dyadic Cohesion (5 items), 5 to 25, Dyadic Consensus (13 items), 13 to 65, and Affectional Expression (4 items), 4 to 14, and a higher score indicates better reported marital quality.

The second dependent variable is intimacy and was measured with the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships inventory (PAIR) (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). The PAIR is a 36-item and self-report inventory that provides information on the levels of perceived marital intimacy on five major areas/types of intimacy: Emotional Intimacy (6 items), Social Intimacy (6 items), Sexual Intimacy (6 items), Intellectual Intimacy (6 items), and Recreational Intimacy (6 items) and 6 items of the Conventionality Scale. The PAIR can be used to assess closeness in all types of dyadic relationships including friendships, dating, premarital, cohabiting, and marriage relationships. In addition, it is sometimes used to assess couples either during premarital or marriage counseling, as well as a feedback instrument in couple enrichment programs. Its results can also be used to provide directions and goals for couples in either therapy or enrichment programs. Some of the questions, for example, are: “My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to. I share in few of my partner’s interests. We seldom find time to do fun things together.” The rest of the questions are presented in Appendix H.

The PAIR is reported to have excellent reliability and validity. The Cronbach alpha values of all the scales are >0.70 (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Participants answered questions using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). As in previous studies (Quittner et al., 1998; Trief, 2001), an overall measure of marital intimacy is created by summing scale scores, and a higher overall score reflects

higher levels of intimacy. The range of the overall intimacy score is 36 to 180 and the ranges of scores of the subscales of intimacy are six to 30 for each subscale.

Main independent variables. There are four independent variables: two relational variables, gender role attitudes and spousal support and two demographic variables, gender and age. The independent variables of gender role attitudes and spousal support were measured by scales.

Gender Roles Attitudes: a scale used by Spence and Helmreich (1978), Cunningham (2005) and Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon and Kiger (2006), with eight items, was used to assess gender ideologies. Respondents marked their responses to the statements (e.g. “Most of the important decisions for the family should be made by the man of the house” and “It is perfectly alright for women to be very active in clubs, politics, and other outside activities before the children are grown up”), to which they indicated the level of agreement from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The statements are coded so that a high score represent support for an egalitarian attitude and a lower score will represent a traditional attitude. The range of scores is from 8 to 40.

Spousal Support: an eight-item scale was used to measure emotional and instrumental spousal support (Purdon et al., 2006; Mickelson et al., 2006). Six items of the scale measure the emotional spousal support and two items of the scale measure the instrumental spousal support. Respondents marked their responses to statements (e.g. “My partner cares about me,” “My partner asks me regularly about my day,” “when I am tired after a demanding day, my partner is willing to help at home”), to which they indicated the level of agreement from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The

statements are coded so that a higher score indicates better reported spousal support. The range of scores is from 8 to 40.

Gender: The participants were asked to mark either “Male” or “Female.” The variable was recoded so that Male was equal to 1 and Female was equal to 2.

Age: The participants were asked “When were you born?” And they filled in the month and the year in the blank spaces. The date of birth was used to calculate each individual’s age.

Control Variables. Number of children living at home: To get information about the presence and number of children, the respondents were asked “How many children do you have? Your children’s gender? How old are your children? And, Are your children living in the home?” In this study only the question, “Are your children living in the home?” is used to measure the presence and number of children in a household.

Religion: “How often does your family have family worship? (1 = twice daily; 2 = once daily; 3 = at least once a week; 4 = less than weekly; 5 = seldom).

Occupation: “What is your occupation/job?” (Clerical, Laborer, Homemaker, Professional, and Self-employed, University/college student, Retired)? These were recoded to reflect the lowest paid status to the highest paid position: 1 = Unemployed, 2 = Homemaker, 3 = Student, 4 = Retired, 5 = Laborer, 6 = Clerical, 7 = Police, 8 = Self-employed and 9 = Professional.

Education: “What is the highest level of formal education you have received thus far?” (Primary education, Junior Secondary, Form Five, Certificate, Diploma, College graduate, BA/BS/LLB, Graduate degree. In our analysis, this variable is recoded into four categories, from the lowest to the highest level of formal education: High school and

below equals 1, Some College equals 2, University Graduate equals 3, and Graduate Degree equals 4.

Length of Marriage: “When did you get married to your spouse?” The respondents filled in the month and the year when they got married. The date was used to calculate the length/duration of marriage. Length of marriage was recoded into five categories: 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10, years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years and 21 to 40 years.

Household Income: this is the combined annual pay of both partners. The question is, “What is your annual household income, after taxes?” The respondents had a blank space to fill in their answers. This variable was recoded into the following five categories (Pula is the currency): 0.00 – 100 000.00, 100 310.00 – 175 000.00, 180 000.00 – 250 000.00, 253 600.00 – 325 000.00 and 333 000.00 and more.

Statistical Analyses

The main question in this study was “What are the predictors of marital satisfaction in Botswana?” This study examined two relational variables, gender role attitudes and spousal support, and two demographic variables, age and gender, on levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. The study tested seven hypotheses: (1) Gender role attitudes will predict marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income, (2) spousal support will predict marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income, (3) marital satisfaction and intimacy will differ by age after controlling for number of children, religion, employment status, education, length of marriage and household

income, (4) Marital satisfaction and intimacy will differ by gender after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income, (5) Age and gender will have an interaction effect on marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income, (6) gender role attitudes will be the most predictor variable of marital satisfaction than spousal support, age and gender, (7) spousal support will be the most predictor variable of intimacy than gender role attitudes, age and gender.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Prior to analysis, time was taken for data cleaning and pre-analyses to identify and address outliers, missing values, and other screening procedures (i.e. normality, homogeneity of variance, and independent errors). Once data were entered and pre-analyses were completed, composite and recoded variables were created from raw scores in preparation for further analyses. Specifically, data were examined for violation of assumptions of parametric tests before the decision was made about the use of the statistical tests described in this study. Given the fact that this was a convenient study design, non-parametric tests would have been appropriate if the parametric test assumptions were violated. In the end, these data did conform with the assumptions of the parametric tests used in this study. As such, a series of univariate, bi-variate and ‘multivariate’ analyses were used to test the aforementioned hypotheses.

In the first series of analyses descriptive statistics were used to examine data in its raw form. These analyses looked at frequency distributions, means, standard deviations and other descriptive methods in order to become familiar with the data. From here preliminary correlation analyses were used to test associations between various

independent variables with each other and outcome variables to determine the strength of these measures.

After the initial descriptive analyses, more inferential statistical methods were implemented. In this study, regression analysis was the primary ‘multivariate’ statistical strategy used. Statistical analysis determined whether the predictor variables remained statistically significant after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. In the initial analyses bi-variate models were used to test correlations between gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender and control variables as well as with the outcome variables of marital satisfaction and intimacy.

Following these correlational analyses a series of hierarchical regression models were used to test the seven hypotheses for this study. Marital satisfaction and intimacy were entered separately as dependent variables with the same controlled variables (number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income) and predictors (gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender) in the models. Each of these models used hierarchical regression to test these hypotheses. Below is an example of the analytical models of marital satisfaction. In these models, the dependent variable is marital satisfaction and the control variables are number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. Model 1 consists of the control variables of number of children, religion, and occupation. Model 2 adds the education, length of marriage and household income variables. In the third model, spousal support is added to the previous model. Model 4 adds gender role attitudes while Model 5 adds age. In Model 6, gender and Model 7 adds both age and

gender. In the eighth Model, the interaction effect of age and gender is considered. In the last model, Model 9, all the four independent variables (gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender) are added. Similar analytical models were used with intimacy and with the subscales of both marital satisfaction and intimacy. See the following example of the overall analytical plan:

Hypothesis 1: Gender role attitudes will predict marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Model 1

$$M1: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + E$$

Model 2

$$M2: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + E$$

Model 3

$$M3: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B7X7 + E$$

Hypothesis 2: Spousal support will predict marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Model 4

$$M M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B8X8 + E$$

Hypothesis 3: Marital satisfaction will differ by age after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Model 5

$$M M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B9X9 + E$$

Hypothesis 4: Marital satisfaction will differ by gender after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Model 6

$$M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B10X10 + E$$

Hypothesis 5: Age and gender will have an interaction effect on marital satisfaction after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

Model 7

$$M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B9X9 + B10X10 + E$$

Model 8

$$M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B9X9 + B10X10 + (B9X9 \times B10X10) + E$$

Hypotheses 6 and 7: (6) gender role attitudes will be the most predictor variable of marital satisfaction than spousal support, age and gender, and (7) spousal support will be the most predictor variable of intimacy than gender role attitudes, age and gender.

Model 9

$$M4: a + B1X1 + B2X2 + B3X3 + B4X4 + B5X5 + B6X6 + B7X7 + B8X8 + B9X9 + B10X10 + E$$

Variables:

a = constant

E = error term

X1= Number of Children

X2= Religion

X3= Occupation

X4= Education

X5= Length of Marriage

X6= Household Income

X7= Gender Role Attitudes

X8= Spousal Support

X9= Age

X10= Gender

Results

This study sought to explore the factors that may increase our understanding of marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana. The following discussion represents the findings from the responses of 309 participants who were eligible and completed the study questionnaire. In the presentation and discussion of the results, statistically marginal significant results will be noted, and that is, results that are above $p = .05$ and less than $p = 1.0$. However, little attention will be placed on the marginally significant results in the discussion of these findings.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics about the key variables used in this study. There were more females than males (56% versus 44%), and the mean age of the respondents was 39. The largest group of participants was between the age of 41 and 50 years old and the oldest age group (51 to 66) represented only 11% of the participants.

Education, income, and occupation are often considered important markers of the quality of social relationships. In this study, those with some college level of education formed the largest group (34%), followed closely by respondents with graduate degrees (33%), high school graduates and less than high school with 20 percent and college graduate making up the remaining 13%. In terms of income, 45 percent of the respondents indicated that they earn 100,000.00 Pula or less and about 23 percent reported income between 253,600.00 and above. Most of the participants indicated that they are professionals (54%), 16 percent said that they are self-employed, 7 percent were clerical, 6 percent college students, 4 percent police and laborers respectively, 3 percent retired, and only 2 percent unemployed.

The average number of children living at home was two, 24 percent reported that they had three children at home, 21 percent indicated that one child was living at home, 14 percent had four or more children and 7 percent did not have any children living at home. Length of marriage is known to be associated with marital quality and intimacy. About one third of the respondents have been married for up to five years, 29 percent had been married between 6 and 10 years, 2 in 10 reported being married between 11 and 15 years and 18 percent between 16 and 40 years. It is expected that religion will play a role in the nature of marital relationships. As such, family worship which is a marker of religious and family activities was assessed in this study. Forty-six percent of the respondents reported that they have family worship at least once a week, 28 percent held worship less than once a week, and the remaining 26 percent seldom engaged in family worship.

The Cronbach's alphas were calculated, to examine the reliability of the scales as used in this study. The Cronbach alpha values of the overall scales are: for DAS is .944, PAIR is .947, Gender Role Attitudes is .757 and Spousal Support is .917.

Table 1

Descriptive Demographics of the Sample: Numbers, Percentages and Categories of Independent Variables used in these analyses

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	136	44
Female	173	56
Age		
22 to 30 years old	54	18
31 to 35 years old	68	22
36 to 40 years old	62	20
41 to 50 years old	91	29
51 to 66 years old	34	11
Education		
High School Grad or less	63	20
Some College	104	34
College Graduate	41	13
Graduate Degree	101	33
Number of Children at Home		
None	23	7
One Child	64	21
Two Children	105	34
Three Children	73	24
Four or More Children	44	14
Occupation		
Unemployed	5	2
Homemaker	15	5
Student	19	6
Retired	9	3
Laborer	12	4
Clerical	21	7
Police	12	4
Self-employed	49	16
Professional	167	54

Table 1 (*Continued*)

Annual Income (in Pula)		
0.00 – 100 000.00	139	45
100 310.00 – 175 000.00	44	14.2
180 000.00 – 250 000.00	55	17.8
253 600.00 – 325 000.00	30	9.7
333 000. 00 and more	41	13.3
Length of Marriage		
1 to 5 years	103	33
6 to 10 years	88	29
11 to 15 years	61	20
16 to 20 years	26	8
21 to 40 years	31	10
Family Worship		
At least once a week	141	46
Less than once a week	88	28
Seldom	42	14
None	38	12

Table 2

Mean Scores of Marital Satisfaction, Intimacy and the Subscales

Dependent Variable	Mean
Marital Satisfaction	113.61 ± 19.72
Dyadic Satisfaction	37.44 ± 6.56
Dyadic Cohesion	18.69 ± 4.03
Dyadic consensus	46.66 ± 9.88
Affection Expression	10.81 ± 2.20
Intimacy	123.02 ± 24.64
Emotional intimacy	21.45 ± 5.08
Social Intimacy	18.76 ± 3.73
Sexual Intimacy	21.85 ± 4.99
Intellectual Intimacy	20.65 ± 4.67
Recreational Intimacy	20.07 ± 4.33

Table 3

Mean Scores of Gender Role Attitudes and Spousal Support

Independent Variable	Mean
General role attitude	28.86 \pm 5.76
Spousal support	27.38 \pm 7.04

Table 4

Mean Scores of Marital Satisfaction and the Subscales by Age and Gender

	Marital Satisfaction	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Age					
22-30	117.37	38.04	19.61	48.22	11.50
31-35	114.10	38.15	18.82	46.62	10.51
36-40	116.32	38.27	19.40	47.53	11.11
41-50	107.75	35.91	17.44	44.10	10.30
51-66	117.47	37.68	19.03	49.56	11.21
Gender					
Males	115.53	37.93	18.93	47.71	10.96
Females	112.12	37.06	18.51	45.84	10.71

Note: The mean scores of Marital Satisfaction are higher for men as compared to women (115.53 versus 112.12) and this pattern, though not strikingly different, is observed for all of the subscales, except for Dyadic Consensus. No Consistent difference between the age groups.

Table 5

Mean Scores of Intimacy and the Subscales by Age and Gender

	Intimacy	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational Intimacy
Age						
22-30	126.20	21.72	18.78	23.22	20.89	20.65
31-35	124.22	21.96	18.87	22.01	20.50	20.71
36-40	127.37	22.08	19.65	22.71	21.63	20.39
41-50	117.25	20.40	18.07	20.76	19.84	19.10
51-66	123.06	21.68	18.76	20.68	21.00	19.94
Gender						
Males	125.52	21.99	18.96	22.07	21.11	20.53
Females	121.05	21.02	18.61	21.67	20.29	19.72

Note: The mean scores of Intimacy are higher for men as compared to women (125.52 versus 121.05) and this pattern, though not strikingly different, is observed for all of the subscales. No Consistent difference between the age groups.

Hypothesis 1

In this study, hypothesis 1 proposed that gender role attitudes would be positively associated with marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. Table 5 below is a summary of the results of the analyses for this hypothesis focusing on marital satisfaction as the outcome. Model 1 considers the contribution of the number of children in the home, family worship and length of marriage. Number of children is unrelated to marital satisfaction. Family worship is positively related to the outcome. That is, number

of children does not provide statistically significant information about the variance explained in marital satisfaction whereas respondents who report high levels of family worship are more likely to have high levels of marital satisfaction. Length of marriage is composed of five categories: 5 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 years and above, and 1 to 4 years is the reference group. While all of the categories have negative coefficients as compared to those who have been married between 1 and 4 years, only the 11 to 15 group was statistically significant. Hence, individuals who have been married between 11 and 15 years reported significantly lower levels of marital satisfaction when compared to the reference group.

In Model 2, three variables were added: education, occupation and income. In this model, occupation and income are, overall, unrelated to marital satisfaction. However, there is a marginally significant negative relationship between those earning 100,310 to 175,000 Pula as compared to those of the lowest level of income, the omitted category. That is, the individuals earning between 100,310 to 175,000 Pula tend to report lower levels of marital satisfaction. However, this marginally significant finding should be interpreted with caution. Further, Model 2 shows a significant positive relationship between education and marital satisfaction. These findings suggest that high levels of education are associated with increased levels of marital satisfaction.

The final model, which is the main model of interest, assesses the independent contribution of gender role attitudes in predicting the variations in marital satisfaction. Gender role attitudes are marginally significantly related to marital satisfaction ($p = .10$). That is, those who support an egalitarian attitude in their marital relationships (higher

scores on the scale of gender role attitudes) tend to report higher levels of marital satisfaction (presented in Table 6).

The above described analytical models were used to assess how gender role attitudes significantly predict variations in the four subscales of marital satisfaction. Not surprisingly, gender role attitudes is only statistically significantly related to one of the four subscales, dyadic satisfaction. There is statistically positive relationship ($p = .01$) between gender role attitudes and dyadic satisfaction (see Table 7).

Table 8 presents the results for the analysis using the same variables across the three models described above but focusing on the outcome variable intimacy. In Model 1, family worship, similar to the findings for marital satisfaction, is positively related to intimacy. In regards to number of children at home, there is no relationship between number of children at home and intimacy. As for length of marriage, those who reported to have 11 to 15 and 16 to 20 years in marriage have significantly lower levels of intimacy as compared to the omitted category, that is, those who have been married for 1 to 4 years.

In Model 2, the coefficient for family worship is reduced slightly to a level of marginal significance though the relationship remains positive while length of marriage stays the same as in Model 1. The added variables in Model 2 are education, occupation and income. Education is positively related to intimacy; high levels of education are associated with higher levels of intimacy. Overall, occupation and income are unrelated to closeness in the relationship as defined by intimacy. However, those who reported income that is between 100,310 to 175,000 Pula have lower levels of intimacy as compared to those belonging to the lowest income category.

Gender role attitudes is added in the final model. As was observed for the results when marital satisfaction was the dependent variable, the relationship between gender role attitudes and intimacy is positive. However, the effect size of gender role attitudes on intimacy is larger than on marital satisfaction; the standardized coefficient for intimacy is .740 while for marital satisfaction is .373. In addition, gender role attitudes is positively significant across all of the five subscales of intimacy (as presented in Table 9). However, for social intimacy the impact of gender role attitudes is only marginally significant.

Table 6

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting marital satisfaction after adding gender role attitudes in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-.776/-.045 (1.086)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	4.361/.182 (1.340) ***
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-3.928/-.090 (2.895)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-10.112/-.204 (3.316) **
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	-3.577/-.050 (4.345)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-.478/-.007 (4.263)	-.827/-.013 (4.248)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	1.775/.103 (1.047) +
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.150/-.013 (.630) +
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-6.234/-.111 (3.279) +
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	-.194/-.004 (.3.134)
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.753/.071 (4.009)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	3.981/.069 (3.530)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Gender Role Attitudes			.373/.109 (.196) +
Constant	113.160	108.757	96.940
R square	.073	.125	.135
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.097
R square change	.073	.052	.011

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 7

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction after adding gender role attitudes in model 3

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Gender Role Attitudes	.173/.152 (.066) **	.052/.074 (.040)	.126/.073 (.100)	.023/.059 (.022)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Table 8

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting intimacy after adding gender role attitudest in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	.123/.006 (1.364)
Family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	3.482/.116 (1.683) *
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	-4.849/-.089 (3.637)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	-12.271/-.199 (4.166) **
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	-10.981/-.124 (5.457) *
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	-2.959/-.036 (5.336)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	2.634/.122 (1.315) *
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.125/-.009 (.791) +
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-7.849/-.111 (4.119)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	.244/.004 (3.936)
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	4.464/.054 (5.036)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	1.178/.016 (4.434)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Gender Role Attitudes			.740/.173 (.246) **
Constant	124.109	117.669	94.248
R square	.049	.099	.126
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.087
R square change	.049	.050	.027

+ p \leq .10 *p \leq .05 **p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 9

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy after adding gender role attitudes in model 3

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Gender Role Attitudes	144/.163 (.051) **	.070/.108 (.038) +	.188/.217 (.049) ***	.159/.196 (.047) ***	.117/.155 (.043) **

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2, predicted that spousal support will predict marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. This hypothesis examines the extent to which there is an independent contribution of spousal support to marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for the aforementioned covariates.

The results of Models 1 through 2 are identical with the results of the analyses that were conducted and reported for hypothesis 1. However, in Model 3, for hypothesis 2, spousal support replaces gender role attitudes used in hypothesis 1. In these analyses, presented in Table 9, spousal support is positively related to marital satisfaction such that those who reported high levels of spousal support also reported high levels of marital satisfaction (statistically significant at .001 level). This pattern is consistent across all of the four subscales of marital satisfaction (Table 11).

Similar analyses were conducted with intimacy and the five subscales of intimacy by examining how spousal support accounted for different levels of intimacy while controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage

and household income. As it is for marital satisfaction, spousal support is found to be positively related to intimacy and to all of the five subscales of intimacy (Tables 12 and 13). That is to say, those who reported high levels of support from their partners also reported high levels of closeness in their marital relationships.

Table 10

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting marital satisfaction after adding spousal support in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-.685/-.039 (.705)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	1.876/.078 (.881) *
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-.203/-.005 (1.900)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-3.475/-.070 (2.197)
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	1.209/.017 (2.857)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-.478/-.007 (4.263)	2.389/.036 (2.785)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	.708/.041 (.682)
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.183/-.016 (.408)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-2.545/-.045 (2.147)
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	3.445/.067 (.2.062) +
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.284/.064 (2.626)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	4.880/.084 (2.298) *
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Spousal Support			2.066/.737 (.103) ***
Constant	113.160	108.757	53.903
R square	.073	.125	.629
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.612
R square change	.073	.052	.504

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 11

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction after adding spousal support in model 3

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Spousal Support	.625/.670 (.040) ***	.325/.568 (.026) ***	.924/.659 (.060) ***	.191/.610 (.014) ***

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Table 12

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting intimacy after adding spousal support in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	.058/.003 (.833)
Family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	.020/.001 (1.041)
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	.355/.077 (2.244)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	-3.377/-.055 (2.596)
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	-4.789/-.054 (3.375)
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	1.538/.019 (3.290)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	1.410/.065 (.806) +
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.288/-.020 (.482)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-2.599/-.037 (2.536)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	5.035/.078 (2.436) *
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	3.995/.048 (3.103)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	2.878/.040 (2.715)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Spousal Support			2.742/.783 (.122) ***
Constant	124.109	117.669	44.861
R square	.049	.099	.668
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.653
R square change	.049	.050	.569

+ p \leq .10 *p \leq .05 **p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 13

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy after adding spousal support in model 3

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Spousal Support	.539/.747 (.028) ***	.290/.547 (.026) ***	.512/.721 (.028) ***	.429/.647 (.029) ***	.432/.703 (.024) ***

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that marital satisfaction and intimacy would differ by age after adjusting for the contribution of number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. The focus for this hypothesis was to examine the contribution of age in the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy while controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. The analyses were the same as for the previous hypothesis except that in the third model age replaced spousal support.

The results in these analyses (Tables 14 through 17) show non-significant relationships between age and marital satisfaction and intimacy. This suggests that age does not account for differences in the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, and not surprisingly, it is not a significant predictor of any of the subscales related to these two outcomes. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported by the results of these analyses.

Table 14

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting marital satisfaction after adding age in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-1.052/-.061 (1.146)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	4.107/.171 (1.347) **
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-3.517/-.081 (3.030)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-9.953/-.201 (3.673) **
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	-3.785/-.053 (4.914)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-4.78/-.007 (4.263)	-4.30/-.007 (5.079)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	2.067/.120 (1.042) *
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.333/-.029 (.628)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-5.695/-.101 (3.288) +
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	-.257/-.005 (3.153)
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.992/.075 (4.039)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	4.755/.082 (3.528)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Age			-.022/.001 (1.233)
Constant	113.160	108.757	108.783
R square	.073	.125	.125
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.086
R square change	.073	.052	.000

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 15

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction after adding age in model 3

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Age	-.210/-.041 (.418)	-.142/-.045 (.250)	.174/.023 (.628)	.156/.091 (.138)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Table 16

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting intimacy after adding age in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	-.447/-.021 (1.452)
Family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	2.986/.100 (1.707) +
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	-4.084/-.075 (3.840)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	-12.046/-.195 (4.655) **
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	-11.523/-.130 (6.228) +
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	-2.333/-.028 (6.438)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	3.215/.149 (1.320) *
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.489/-.035 (.796)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-6.774/-.096 (4.168)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	.124/.002 (3.996)
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	4.922/.059 (5.119)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	2.713/.037 (4.472)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Age			.029/.002 (1.562)
Constant	124.109	117.669	117.636
R square	.049	.099	.099
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.060
R square change	.049	.050	.000

+ p \leq .10 *p \leq .05 **p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 17

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy after adding age in model 3

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational Intimacy
Age	.038/.010 (.326)	.005/.002 (.239)	-.412/-.106 (.316)	.295/.081 (.297)	-.168/-.050 (.270)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that marital satisfaction and intimacy would differ by gender after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. The focus for this hypothesis was to examine whether gender would make any difference in the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy while controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. The analyses were the same as for the previous hypothesis except that in the third model gender replaced age as the main variable of interest.

The results in these analyses (Tables 18 through 21) show a non-significant relationship between gender and marital satisfaction and intimacy. Being male or female does not account for differences in the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. Consistent with expectation, gender is also a nonsignificant predictor for each of the subscales associated with both of the dependent variables used in this study. However, it should be noted that gender is a marginally significant negative predictor of two subscales of intimacy (emotional intimacy and recreational intimacy). This suggests that males tend to report lower levels of emotional and recreational intimacy than women.

Therefore, the overall hypothesis of gender difference in marital satisfaction and intimacy is not supported by these data. The marginal differences between men and women that were noted may be interpreted with some caution but point to some interesting possible patterns of gender differences.

Table 18

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting marital satisfaction after adding gender in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-1.124/-.065 (1.079)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	4.257/.178 (1.340) **
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-3.625/-.083 (2.895)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-10.094/-.204 (3.324) **
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	-4.333/-.061 (4.366)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-4.78/-.007 (4.263)	-.683/-.010 (4.256)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	2.009/.117 (1.038) +
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.566/-.050 (.643)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-5.423/-.096 (3.279) +
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	-.438/-.009 (3.143)
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.336/.065 (4.040)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	4.473/.077 (3.519)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Gender			-3.401/-.086 (2.254)
Constant	113.160	108.757	115.364
R square	.073	.125	.131
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.093
R square change	.073	.052	.007

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 19

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction after adding gender in model 3

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Gender	-.705/-.053 (.766)	-.462/-.057 (.458)	-1.960/-.099 (1.147)	-.274/-.062 (.254)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Table 20

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting intimacy after adding gender in model 3

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	-.528/-.024 (1.366)
Family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	3.189/.107 (1.697) +
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	-4.192/-.077 (3.667)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	-12.168/-.197 (4.210) **
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	-12.176/-.137 (5.529) *
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	-2.552/-.031 (5.390)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	3.134/.145 (1.315) *
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.810/-.057 (.814)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-6.402/-.091 (4.153)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	-.131/-.002 (3.980)
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	4.025/.048 (5.116)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	-4.717/-.095 (2.855) +
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Gender			.029/.002 (1.562)
Constant	124.109	117.669	126.833
R square	.049	.099	.107
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.068
R square change	.049	.050	.008

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 21

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy after adding gender in model 3

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational Intimacy
Gender	-1.052/-.103 (.595) +	-.326/-.043 (.439)	-.429/-.043 (.581)	-.758/-.081 (.544)	-.852/-.098 (.494) +

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis five predicted that age and gender would have an interaction effect on marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. The analyses were the same as for other hypotheses except that in these analyses attention was paid to the interaction of age and gender on marital satisfaction and intimacy.

The Tables 22 through 25 show that the interaction between age and gender is not significant in accounting for differences in levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. The interaction of age and gender is also not statistically significant across all the subscales of marital satisfaction and intimacy except for recreational intimacy where it is negatively significant (at .05 level). The results suggest that younger males are more likely to report lower levels of recreational intimacy than their female counterparts.

Table 22

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting marital satisfaction after adding the interaction of age and gender

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-.638/-.037 (1.108)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	4.049/.169 (1.336) **
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-2.458/-.056 (2.968)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-7.979/-.161 (3.544) *
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	-1.266/-.018 (4.628)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-.478/-.007 (4.263)	2.999/.046 (4.762)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	2.042/.118 (1.037) *
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.502/-.044 (.632)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-5.686/-.101 (3.272) +
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	-.469/-.009 (3.142)
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.702/.071 (4.018)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	4.306/.074 (3.523)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Interaction of age and gender			-1.005/-.114 (.620)
Constant	113.160	108.757	11.599
R square	.073	.125	.132
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.094
R square change	.073	.052	.008

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 23

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction after adding the interaction of age and gender

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Interaction-Age & Gender	-.328/-.112 (.210))	-.189/-.105 (.126)	-.491/-.111 (.316)	.003/.003 (.070)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Table 24

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting intimacy after adding the interaction of age and gender

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	.116/.005 (1.404)
Family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	2.904/.097 (1.693) +
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	-2.650/-.049 (3.760)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	-9.376/-.152 (4.490) *
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	-8.102/-.091 (5.863)
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	2.309/.028 (6.033)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	3.180/.148 (1.314) *
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.709/-.050 (.801)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-6.767/-.096 (4.146)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	-.158/-.002 (3.980)
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	4.551/.055 (5.091)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	2.121/.029 (4.464)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Interaction of age and gender			-1.323/-.120 (.786)
Constant	124.109	117.669	121.410
R square	.049	.099	.108
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.068
R square change	.049	.050	.009

+ p \leq .10 *p \leq .05 **p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 25

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy after adding the interaction of age and gender

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational Intimacy
Interaction-Age & Gender	-.243/-.107 (.164)	-.069/-.041 (.121)	-.317/-.142 (.159)	-.102/-.049 (.150)	-.317/-.164 (.135) *

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis six stated that gender role attitudes would be the most significant predictor of marital satisfaction as compared to other main independent variables such as spousal support, age and gender. In these analyses the four main independent variables, age, gender, spousal support and gender role attitudes are all entered at the same time in the third model to assess their impact on marital satisfaction while controlling for parenting, religion, employment status, education, length of marriage and household income as in the previous analyses.

Tables 26 and 27 present the results of how age, gender, spousal support and gender role attitudes contribute to the variance in the levels of marital satisfaction and its four subscales. As in the previous analyses, age, gender and gender role attitudes are not significant predictors of marital satisfaction. Only spousal support is positively significant in predicting marital satisfaction (at .001 level). That is, higher levels of spousal support are associated with increased levels of marital satisfaction. This suggests that spousal support is the most influential predictor of marital satisfaction when

compared to age, gender and gender role attitudes. As for the four subscales of marital satisfaction: gender is not significant in any of the four subscales; age is positively significant (at .05 level) in predicting affection expression; spousal support is positively significant across all four subscales; and gender role attitudes is marginally positively significant for dyadic satisfaction.

Table 26

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for age, gender, spousal support and gender role attitudes in predicting marital satisfaction

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-1.341/-.077 (1.090)	-1.059/-.061 (1.080)	-.725/-.042 (.760)
Family worship	4.637/.194 (1.346) ***	4.109/.172 (1.339) **	1.978/.083 (.896) *
Length of Marriage			
5-10 years	-4.734/-.108 (2.930)	-3.533/-.081 (2.901)	-.526/-.012 (1.999)
11-15 years	-9.788/-.198 (3.338) **	-9.980/-.202 (3.330) **	-3.928/-.079 (2.442)
16-20 years	-3.190/-.045 (4.371)	-3.824/-.054 (4.362)	.644/.009 (3.240)
21 years and above	-1.056/-.016 (4.304)	-.478/-.007 (4.263)	1.586/.024 (3.381)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		2.068/.120 (1.040) *	.648/.038 (.692)
Occupation		-.334/-.029 (.625)	-.166/-.015 (.425)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-5.693/.101 (3.281) +	-2.638/-.047 (2.167)
180,000 to 250,000		-.256/-.005 (3.147)	3.447/.062 (2.074) +
253,000 to 325,000		4.987/.075 (4.025)	4.146/.062 (2.656)
333,000 and above		4.755/.082 (3.522)	4.702/.081 (2.331) *
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Age			.317/.021 (.872)
Gender			-.148/-.004 (1.632)
Spousal Support			2.058/.735 (.106) ***
Gender Role Attitudes			.081/.024 (.132)
Constant	113.160	108.757	51.450
R square	.073	.125	.629
Adjusted R square	.055	.089	.609
R square change	.073	.052	.505

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 27

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for age, gender, spousal support and gender role attitudes in predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Age	-.087/-.017 (.333)	-.092/-.029 (.219)	.266/.035 (.508)	.229/.134 (.117) *
Gender	.045/.003 (.622)	-.034/-.004 (.410)	-.353/-.018 (.950)	.194/.044 (.218)
Spousal Support	.617/.662 (.040) ***	.324/.566 (.027) ***	.923/.657 (.061) ***	.194/.619 (.014) ***
Gender Role Attitudes	.084/.074 (.050) +	.006/.008 (.033)	.000/.00 (.077)	-.007/-.019 (.018)

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis
Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis seven stated that spousal support would be the most significant predictor variable of intimacy as compared to gender role attitudes, age and gender. In these analyses, like in hypothesis 6, the four main independent variables, age, gender, role attitude and spousal support are all entered at the same time to examine their influence on intimacy after adjusting for the covariates identified in this study.

Table 28 presents the results of how age, gender, gender role spousal support attitudes contribute to the explained variance for intimacy. Like in the previous analyses, age and gender are not significant in predicting change in the levels of intimacy. Gender role attitudes are positively significant at .05 level. That is, the respondents with high scores on gender role attitudes also tend to report high levels of intimacy. Spousal support is positively significant at .001 level. This finding is consistent with the results reported above for the relationship between spousal support and marital satisfaction; high

levels of spousal support are associated with increase in intimacy. As for the five subscales of intimacy: age and gender are not significant; gender role attitudes is significant across five subscales except for social intimacy; spousal support is significant across all the five subscales of intimacy (at .001 level).

Table 28

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for age, gender, gender role attitudes and spousal support in predicting intimacy

Variables	Model I	Model II	Model III
Number of children at home	-.788/-.036 (1.380)	-.438/-.020 (1.369)	.207/.010 (.890)
Frequency of family worship	3.652/.122 (1.703) *	2.983/.100 (1.697) +	.384/.013 (1.049)
Length/duration of Marriage			
5-10 years	-5.551/-.102 (3.708)	-4.064/-.075 (3.677)	-.358/-.007 (2.340)
11-15 years	-12.046/-.195 (4.224)**	-12.010/-.194 (4.221)**	- 4.271/-.084 (2.858)
16-20 years	-11.028/-.124 (5.531) *	-11.471/-.129 (5.528) *	- 5.402/-.061 (3.793)
21 years and above	-2.910/-.036 (5.447)	-2.268/-.028 (5.403)	.330/.004 (3.958)
1-4 years (Omitted)			
Education		3.214/.149 (1.318) *	1.134/.053 (.810)
Occupation		-.488/-.034 (.793)	-.189/-.013 (.497)
Income (in Pula)			
100,310 to 175,000		-6.777/.096 (4.159) +	-3.089/-.044 (2.537)
180,000 to 250,000		.123/.002 (3.989)	4.984/.077 (2.428) *
253,000 to 325,000		4.928/.059 (5.102)	3.533/.043 (3.109)
333,000 and above		2.713/.037 (4.464)	2.042/.028 (2.729)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)			
Age			.338/.018 (1.021)
Gender (M = 1, F = 2)			-.941/-.019 (1.910)
Gender Role Attitudes			.366/.086 (.124) *
Spousal Support			2.702/.772 (.124) ***
Constant	124.109	117.669	35.767
R square	.049	.099	.675
Adjusted R square	.030	.063	.657
R square change	.049	.050	.575

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001; Standard errors in parenthesis

Table 29

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for age, gender, gender role attitudes and spousal support in predicting the five subscales of intimacy

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational Intimacy
Age	.074/.019 (.233)	.084/.029 (.217)	-.334/-.086 (.230)	.370/.102 (.240)	-.175/-.052 (.201)
Gender	-.307/-.030 (.436)	.131/.017 (.406)	-.087/-.009 (.430)	-.027/-.003 (.450)	-.424/-.049 (.377)
Gender Role Attitudes	.072/.082 (.035) *	.027/.042 (.033)	.117/.135 (.035) ***	.099/.123 (.036) **	.061/.082 (.030) *
Spousal Support	.530/.735 (.028) ***	.289/.545 (.026) ***	.499/.704 (.028) ***	.420/.634 (.029) ***	.423/.688 (.024) ***

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

The results of this study reveal the importance of gender role attitudes and spousal support as key predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy when compared to age and gender. That is, individuals who reported high scores in gender role attitudes and spousal support also reported high scores in marital satisfaction and intimacy and across age and gender. In addition, the results show a marginal effect of the interaction of age and gender on marital satisfaction and intimacy, with younger men reporting less emotional and recreational intimacy as compared to their counterparts.

Exploratory analyses were carried out with age recoded into two and three categories. For instance, age was first recoded into young couples (ages 22 to 40), middle age couples (ages 41 to 59), and older couples (ages 60 plus), and also recoded into older couples (ages 60 plus) and others (all those who were less than 60 years old), and still age was not found to be significant for both outcome variables and their subscales.

Three more exploratory analyses were carried out and age was recoded into the following

categories: (i) Three categories (ages 22-30, 31-40 and 41-66), and the results were statistically significant for the overall scale of marital satisfaction and for dyadic consensus. (ii) Two categories, ages 22 to 40 (young couples) and older couples (41 to 66), and the results showed marginal significance for marital satisfaction and statistically significant for dyadic consensus. (iii) Additionally, two groups, middle age couples (ages 41 to 59) and others (ages 22 to 40 and 60 to 66), and the results indicated a negative and marginal significance for marital satisfaction and statistically significant for dyadic consensus.

Discussion and Implications

Discussion

This study explored the factors that are important predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana, an African country that is confronted by the challenges of industrialization and urbanization which impact the African philosophy of life and relationships. The empirical literature suggests that marital relationship in developing countries, such as Botswana, seem to turn to be similar to those of developed countries. This study is important as it examined known predictors of marital satisfaction and intimacy in developed countries within contexts of urbanization, industrialization and African world view. There is an emphasis on embracing family and a valuing of societal support within the framework of living in community/kinship with one other. Specifically, this study examined how gender role attitudes, spousal support, age and gender predicted marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana after adjusting important confounding factors such as number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income.

The results of this study are quite interesting, with some surprises, as they support or not support the hypotheses. Thus, the findings highlight similarities and differences in terms of predictor variables of marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana as compared to what the literature from developed countries and elsewhere have identified as the key contributors to these relationship.

The first hypothesis predicted that gender role attitudes would be positively associated with marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children,

religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. This hypothesis was supported for both marital satisfaction and intimacy, though more so for intimacy than for marital satisfaction. Gender role attitudes is statistically significant in the overall scale of intimacy and in all the subscales of intimacy while for marital satisfaction is marginally significant for the overall scale and only statistically significant in one subscale, dyadic satisfaction.

These findings suggest that what makes gender role attitudes to be related to marital satisfaction is the presence of the dyadic satisfaction subscale in marital satisfaction. The dyadic satisfaction describes the marital relationship in terms of closeness, bonding, understanding each other while other subscales assess how couples experience consensus and express affection. Hence, in this sample, as far as gender role attitudes are concerned, those who feel equal in a relationship tend to experience emotional, social, sexual, intellectual and recreational closeness. Thus, feeling equal in a relationship seems to bring contentment in areas of intimacy but not necessarily in the areas of marital satisfaction that deal with how to express affection and making decisions together.

The literature suggests that the more couples support and practice egalitarian attitudes the higher levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy would be. This indicates that the higher the scores of gender role attitudes (supportive of egalitarian versus traditional gender roles) the higher the scores of marital satisfaction and intimacy. While some may argue that most Africans would support traditional gender role attitudes, which would more likely predict marital satisfaction and intimacy, the results show otherwise. This sample shows that this African sample is rather more egalitarian than it is traditional

and that egalitarian attitudes are more likely to determine couples' marital happiness and closeness. These findings appear to be a departure from the dominance of an expected traditional gender role attitudinal orientation and points to the need to further explore ways in which gender role attitudes maybe shifting, especially within the framework of marital relationships.

The second hypothesis predicted that spousal support would positively influence marital satisfaction and intimacy after controlling for number of children, religion, occupation, education, length of marriage and household income. This hypothesis was supported for both marital satisfaction and intimacy. Spousal support, in this study, was found to be statistically significant across marital satisfaction and intimacy and across all the subscales. This is consistent with the literature (Johnson, Hobfoll, Stevan & Zalcberg-Linetzy, 1993; Dehle et al., 2001), and that is, people who feel supported by their spouses tend to report higher levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. It is also consistent with the African world view (Wiredu & Gyekye, 1992; Bell, 2002) of living in community, kinship and in support with each other, especially with family members.

It looks like, in addition to what other studies suggest about the importance of spousal support on marital satisfaction and intimacy, what individuals learned from their families and communities regarding supporting one another plays out in marital relationships. While spousal support is an important factor internationally, according to the literature, in this context it is even so as people tend to bring this along from their social and family backgrounds that promote social support and interdependent living for single and married individuals. Violating social support in this community, therefore, could be a big thing, for every one is expected to be supportive, more so to one's relatives

(spouse). Lack of social support could be a violation of one's core values of African beliefs.

It is interesting to note that in this study, carried out in a city, where industrialization, urbanization and migration are at their peak, couples seem to be able to positively deal with gender roles and spousal support, factors faced by developed countries. Since other variables such as number of children, socioeconomic status and religion were controlled for in this study, the results suggest that there is something in this African sample, in Botswana, that encourages men and women to support each other in their marital relationships, careers and social lives and encourages both men and women to support egalitarian gender role attitudes. Thus communities, such as in Botswana, which still hold onto the world views that encourage kinship, living in community and family support and encourage husbands and wives to support each other in their marital relationships, careers, social life and families of origin are more likely to report high levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy. This kind of relating, in the community, among extended family members and in marriage, would be more likely carried out into the next generation.

In this study, age, in the third hypothesis, does not tell us anything about marital satisfaction and intimacy. This is not what was expected as far as the literature is concerned. The curvilinear pattern that was expected due to age on marital satisfaction was not found in this study. That is, it was expected that many would report lower scores on marital satisfaction between the ages of 41 to 59 as compared to those younger or older; instead the opposite was found to be true for this sample. This finding suggests that the African view of life, regarding support in taking care of the children and helping in

household duties, could be benefiting this group. This is to say; married individuals get help from extended family members, or hired help, to support the working fathers and mothers with parenting and caring out household duties.

Age, in the last three exploratory analyses, was found to be significant only to marital satisfaction but not intimacy, and to the subscale dyadic consensus of marital satisfaction. The results suggest that while age, in this sample, generally does not explain one's levels of marital satisfaction and closeness, those within the ages of 41 to 59 turn to report higher levels of marital satisfaction in terms of dyadic consensus. This would mean that when couples get to the ages 41 to 59, they are more likely to agree in areas such as handling family finances, recreation, religion, friends, philosophy of life, time together household tasks, in-laws and time together, issues that characterize the dyadic consensus subscale. At this age, 41 to 59, married individuals turn to do better in their marital relationships than those younger or older.

In this study, those who are more than 59 years old make up a total of less than 2 percent of the sample while the majority are those who are 22 to 40 years old (59.5 %) and followed by those who are 41 to 59 years old (38.5 %). Hence, in this study, we are missing the older married people to show any difference among the age groups, in comparison to the young and middle-aged married people. It was expected that the younger and old groups would at least report higher levels of marital satisfaction than the middle-aged group. The absence of the older group is due to the fact that many go to their respective villages upon retirement and that Botswana, as a young country, has fairly young professionals.

Gender, like age, for the most part, did not show any level of significant differences of marital happiness and closeness. Men and women, in this study, are generally not different in terms of levels of marital happiness and closeness when looking at the overall scales and subscales. However, in the emotional and recreational intimacy subscales, there is marginal significance, suggesting that men tend to report lower levels of emotional and recreational intimacy. In this sample, men as compared to women report feelings of less close to their wives when it comes to emotional and recreation activities.

Interestingly, there is no significant interaction effect between age and gender in the overall scales and most of the subscales of marital satisfaction and intimacy except for recreational intimacy subscale. Recreational intimacy is statistically significant, suggesting that the younger husbands tend to report lower levels of recreational intimacy. This may mean that after marriage, recreation takes another form of transition as these men assume marital responsibilities. If you are young and male, you are more likely to have a lower level of recreational intimacy; it takes a while before you can balance your recreational life with the new role of being a husband. The results of this hypothesis, the interaction of age and gender, help explain in part why men, in the previous hypothesis, that men tend to report feeling less close to their wives when it comes to emotional and recreational intimacy.

Looking at the fact that age, gender and the interaction of age and gender are in the most part not significant in determining the levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, one would make the following conclusions. First, it appears that in this developing country, men and women, and across the ages, are confronted, almost at the same levels, by challenges and blessings of industrialization and urbanization. While

industrialization and urbanization bring along individualism, loneliness, second shift for the working wives and broken family ties with one's extended family, it looks like this population still upholds African values, such as help from extended family members to take care of children, that help individuals and families cope with the demands of city living. As the literature (Berk, 2006) points out, such as among African-Americans, ethnic groups that continue with their world view of living (in contact with extended families, living in community and social support with family and neighbors) generally do well in terms of family life satisfaction, raising children, adapting to city life and in dealing with stressful situations in life. Hence, in Botswana, the African view of living, for the most part, is not eroded by the presence of industrialization and urbanization. This suggests that the social and family support systems, for the most part, are still intact, and that help for household duties and caring for the children is available either from hired help or from relatives and this helps cushion the negative impact of industrialization and urbanization.

Second, considering that the country, the Republic of Botswana, is young (43 years since independence), with the country's stable politics and rich economy, free/low cost of education and health care, there are many opportunities for families, for both men and women and across age, which make it possible for couples and families navigate life in the midst of industrialization and urbanization. Basically, it takes time and the passing of generations to see the negative influences of industrialization and urbanization on marriage and families.

The last two hypotheses in this study compared the effects of the four main predictor variables (age, gender, spousal support and gender role attitudes) on the two

outcome variables (marital satisfaction and intimacy). The results of these analyses further highlight gender role attitudes and spousal support as the most predictor variables of marital satisfaction and intimacy, above and beyond age and gender, in this study. Specifically, spousal support is the most predictor of marital satisfaction, followed by gender role attitudes and gender role attitudes is the most predictor of intimacy, followed by spousal support while age and gender remained either none or marginally significant.

In this sample, therefore, is not necessarily about gender (being either male or female) but an individual's gender role attitudes that influence one's level of intimacy and marital satisfaction. What matters in this sample is how married people act and respond to each other on the basis of the meanings that they have placed on each other's actions, unspoken rules that govern the relationship and on the basis of learned societal values and beliefs as husbands and wives. Specifically, it is not about hierarchy in a relationship but viewing each other as equal partners and acting out this belief in their daily interactions that determines the individuals' levels of marital satisfaction and closeness. In addition, it is the sense of feeling supported by one's spouse that influences one's marital satisfaction and intimacy among this sample. Support (societal, family and spousal), is a relational value that helps bring couples and families into close relationships and better personal interactions. Gender role attitudes and spousal support seem to influence marital satisfaction and intimacy across age and gender.

One observation is that family worship is a very significant factor in the context of relational quality. In the preliminary analysis that were conducted, before the formulation of the final models which were tested, other variables such as religious attendance did not pass the ten percent rule as significant variables. Only the variables

that were at ten percent significant were then empirically tested in the final models. Therefore, among other religious factors, family worship was included into the final models and it continued to be significant for both marital satisfaction and intimacy. This finding suggests that it is the closeness that happens when people have family worship, the benefit of sharing similar religious values and rituals, time together during family worship, which contributes to relational closeness and happiness. That is, the act of doing something together, activity plus time, brings spouses close to each other.

Limitations of the Research

There are some limitations in this study that need to be mentioned. First, as data collected were non-random sampling, the interpretation of the results should be done with caution. Second, since data collected were about married individuals, rather than about couples, the applications of the study will be limited to married men and women but not couples in Gaborone. Specifically, in this study we were not be able to compare husbands with their wives but only what married men and women said about their marriages. Third, there are other variables, such as ethnicity, household labor, relationship with in-laws, husbands and wives living at different geographic locations for extended period of time, communication skills and problem solving skills, which were not accounted for in this study, leaving room for these as possible causes for various levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy.

Fourth, since the sample was from the city of Gaborone, the applications of this study will not be generalizable to all married people who reside in other parts of the Republic of Botswana. Fifth, this study did not control for assets, such as having cattle

and farms, which could contribute to a family's annual income and social status. Lastly, this study was a cross sectional and self report study. As such, the study did not account for transitions such as parenthood or retirement of spouses, or participants' feelings over time, and some participants could have embellished their answers to present themselves in a better light as they answered the questions.

Implications for Future Research

Although this study has looked at some differences among individuals who are married, in terms of their different levels of marital satisfaction and intimacy, spousal support, gender role attitudes, age and gender, findings may be expanded by a longitudinal study that would examine the same people for several years. A longitudinal study, carried out to examine the same couples across time, and across different lifecycles, may prove beneficial. For example, a study looking at the same married individuals as they transition from having no children to having children, or from being active in the labor force to retirement, could reveal changes in marital satisfaction and intimacy. In addition, it could be beneficial to use qualitative or mixed methods approaches as these would enrich the understanding of Batswana and their family functioning. For instance, using a mixed method approach (combining quantitative and qualitative methods in one study), one would carry out some group studies, or interviews, among young couple, middle age couples and later life couples, and thereby rise questions that would be carried on in a quantitative survey, with the input from the three groups.

Further, a qualitative study could be carried out, for instance, to explore why gender role attitudes was not significant on some of the subscales of marital satisfaction and intimacy. Also, a confirmatory factor analysis, in a study, would be expedient to confirm whether these subscales operate in the same way in Botswana as they do in other parts of the world. The results also indicate that when married people get to 11 to 15 years in marriage, there is increased level of discontentment. A future study could explore this phenomenon, to understand the marital expectations, presence of children in marriage and any other relevant variables.

The results of this study should initiate further examination and discussion of variables that could influence the constructs of marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana, and how measurements that are used in the West could be translated and used in this context and at the same time looking at the African context in terms of the African world view, its dynamics, changes and challenges.

Theoretical Implications

The symbolic interaction theory provided an appropriate framework for this study. Based on this framework, it was anticipated that the symbols used in couples' interactions would be a basis for the participants in this study to point out what marital satisfaction and intimacy entail in their relationships. The findings of this study reveal how the interactions (symbols) shared between husbands and wives play a statistically significant role in determining meaning to self as measured by marital satisfaction and intimacy. The results of this study also highlight the influence of the African world view on the symbolic interaction theory, and that is, symbols and influences from the society

that are carried out by married individuals. For instance, family and social support are concepts that play out as spousal support among married individuals, the importance of religion among Africans becomes an important variable in terms of rituals such as family worship and church attendance which enhance closeness and social network among married people.

Further, the results of the study also suggest a need to further explore the suitability of the symbolic interaction theory as a framework for studying Batswana in their social context. There could be symbols and meanings from the larger societal level of interaction among Batswana that could play a role in the findings of this study, such as expression of affection, problem solving skills, social support from family of origin and friends and communication skills. Future studies that would examine this possibility would bring further understanding of this study's findings as well as the symbolic interaction framework and challenge existing theories about couple relationships in Botswana.

Clinical Practice

The results of this study will be of benefit to mental health professionals (a fairly new profession in Botswana), marriage officers, pastors and family life educators, as they deal with married and prospective couples in Botswana. Mental health professionals in Botswana will be able to explore couples' perspectives on gender role attitudes and how they play out in their marital relationships. This means looking at how couples carry out and share responsibilities at home in terms of doing chores and how this enhance/impact their marital satisfaction and intimacy; how couples deal with gender role stereotypes in

their relationships. This also involves addressing issues of meaning and expectations among couples, either in therapy or through relational enhancement programs. The results of this study provide some support for the use of family therapy interventions in Botswana and neighboring countries, open a dialogue among couples regarding marital expectations and what they bring in from families of origin and provoke some thoughts among family educators in creating interventions relevant to the African context.

Further, when dealing with this population, therapists and counselors should observe common activities such as worship, which couples are doing, or could do, to bring together spouses or enhance marital satisfaction and intimacy. This means counselors could observe and highlight common activities such as sports, attending wedding and graduation ceremonies and visiting the cattle post and friends together, which are common denominators of many couples/families, as exercises for couples/families in terms of enhancing relational closeness. Doing something together seems to promote closeness; activity plus time together equals closeness.

On the other hand, the results of this study highlight the importance of dealing with one's own biases. Specifically, therapists and counselors, when dealing with this population, should be aware of their own gender role biases, or suspend their biases, in light to these findings, for the findings challenge the stereotypical view of African culture in terms of gender roles.

This study provides a unique contribution to the field of marital and family therapy. The study increases the knowledge base as it examined marital satisfaction and intimacy in Botswana, an area where such studies have never been carried out. The results of this study highlight and add cultural dimensions, from an African perspective,

to the rest of the world of mental health professionals, regarding differences and similarities in mean making, marital satisfaction and intimacy among couples. As such, this study is very important as it fills an important gap in the imperical literature by examining the influence of gender role attitudes and spousal support on marital satisfaction and intimacy an African context.

Lastly, this study highlights the resiliency of spouses as they manage to maintain high levels of marital satisfaction, intimacy, egalitarian gender roles and spousal support in an erra of industrialization, labor migration and urbization. In addition, some couples get to be separated due to the government Civil Service sector requirement for workers who are willing and able to relocate to new jobs and reassignments. This study may be of benefit to the government of Botswana, especially the government Civil Sector, to look into how the separation of husbands and wives impact the marital satisfaction, stability and intimacy and parenting roles among couples. Hence this study would help in the government discussions, interventions and policies in dealing with jobs and reassignments for married inividuals, for better marital and job satisfaction.

The results of this study point to the importance of exploring the salience of the quality of marital relationships within the African context identified in this dissertation. Marital satisfaction and intimacy are impacted by the levels of spousal support and to a lesser extent by gender role attitudes. The findings of this study highlight the need to continue to explore marital quality within this geographical environment.

References

- Acitelli, L. K. (1996). *The neglected links between marital support and marital satisfaction*. In G. R. Pierce, B. R. Sarason, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Handbook of social support and the family* (pp. 83-103). New York: Plenum.
- Acitelli, L. K., & Antonucci, T. C. (1994). Gender differences in the link between marital support and satisfaction in older couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 688-698
- Adams, G.A., King, L.A. & King, D.W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 411-420.
- Aida, Y. & Falbo, T. (1991). Relationship between marital satisfaction, resources, and power strategies. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 24, No. 1-2, 43-56.
- Allen, S.M. & Webster, P.S. (2001). When wives get sick: Gender roles attitudes, marital happiness, and husbands' contribution to household labor. *Gender and Society*, Vol.15, No.6, 898-916.
- Allport, G.W. (1966). The religious context of prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 5, 447-457.
- Allport, G.W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Almeida, D.M. & Kessler, R.C. (1998). Everyday stressors and gender differences in daily distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 670-680.
- Amato, P.R., & Booth, A. (1995). Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 58-66.
- Amato, P.R., & Booth, A. (2001). The legacy of parents' marital discord: Consequences for children's marital quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(4), 627-638.
- Amato, P.R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110 (1), 26-46.
- Amato, P.R. (2001). Children of divorce in the 1990s: An update of the meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3), 355-370.
- Amato, P. & Rogers, S. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 612-624.

- Anderson, S.A., Russell, C.S. & Schumm, W.R. (1983). "Perceived marital quality and family life-cycle categories: A further analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 45, 127-139.
- Anthony, M.J. (1993). The relationship between marital satisfaction and religious maturity. *Religious Education*, Vol. 88, No. 1.
- Apostel, L. (1981). *African Philosophy: Myth or Reality*. Belgium: E. Stary-Scientia.
- Aycan, Z. & Eskin, M. (2005). Relative contributions of childcare, spousal support, and organizational support in reducing work-family conflict for men and women: The case of Turkey. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 53, Nos. 7/8.
- Bahr, H.M. (1981). Toward a conceptualization and treatment of interfaith marriage. *Family Therapy Collections*, 25, 71-88.
- Barnett, R.C., Marshall, N.L., Raudenbush, S.W. & Brennan, R.T. (2006). Gender and the relationship between job experiences and psychological distress: A study of dual-earner couples. *National Library of Medicine*.
- Barth, F.D. (2001). Money as a tool for negotiating separateness and connectedness in the therapeutic relationship. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 29, 79-93.
- Barkley, M.L. (1993). Balancing work and family: The experience of new parents. *Australian Journal of Marriage and Family*, 14, 143-150.
- Bartley, S. J., Blanton, P.W. & Gilliard, J.L. (2005). Huabands and wives in dual-earner marriages: Decision-making, gender role attitudes, division of household labor, and equity. *Marriage and Family Review*, 37, 69-94.
- Baucom, D.H., Sayers, S.L., & Duhe, A. (1989). Attributional Style and Attributional Patterns Among Married Couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(4), 596-607.
- Beets, G., Liefbroer, A. C., & De Jong Gierveld, J. (1999). *Changes in fertility values And behaviour: A life course perspective*. In R. Leete (Ed.), *Dynamics of values In fertility change* (pp. 100-120). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, R.H. (2002). *Understanding African Philosophy: A Cross-Cultural Approach to Classical and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Belle, D. (1987). Gender differences in the social moderators of stress. In R.C. Barnett, L. Biener, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.), *Gender and stress* (pp. 257-277). New York: Free.

- Belsky, J. (1990). Children and marriage. In F.D. Fincham & T.N. Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage: Basic issues and applications* (pp. 119-134). New York: Press.
- Belsky, J. Lang, M. & Rovine, M. (1985). Stability and change in marriage across the transition to parenthood: A second study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 855-866.
- Belsky, J. & Rovine, M. R. (1990). Patterns of marital change across the transition to parenthood: Pregnancy to three years postpartum. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 5-19.
- Belsky, J., Spanier, G.B. & Rovine, M. R. (1983). Stability and change in marriage across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 567-577.
- Berger, P. & Kellner, H. (1964). Marriage and the construction of reality. *Diogenes*, 46, 1-24.
- Berger, P.L. & Luckma, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise it's the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Berk, Laura E. (2006). *Development through the lifespan*. U.S.A.: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berman, E.M. & Lief, H.I. (1975). Marital therapy from a psychiatric perspective: An overview. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 132, 583-592.
- Bhowon, U., Ngtsseung, C. & Kaajal, B. (2008). Work-family conflict and satisfaction of married working women in Mauritius. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, Vol. 23, No. 1.
- Bianchi, S.M., Milkie, M.A., Sayer, L.C. & Robinson, J.P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces*, 79, 91-228.
- Blair-Loy, M. & DeHart, G. (2003). Family and career trajectories among African-American female attorneys. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 24, No. 7, 908-933.
- Blaisure, K., & Allen, K. (1995). Feminism and ideology and the practice of marital equality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57, 5-19.
- Botkin, D. R., Weeks, M. O., & Morris, J. E. (2000). Changing marriage role expectations: 1961-1996. *Sex Roles*, 42, 933-942.
- Bradbury, T. N. (1994). Unintended effects of marital research on marital relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 8(2), 187-201.

- Bradbury, T.N., Beach, S.R.H., Fincham, F.D., & Nelson, G.M. (1996). Attributions and Behavior in Functional and Dysfunctional Marriages. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64(3), 569-576.
- Bradbury, T. N., Fincham F. D., & Beach, S. R.H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 964-980.
- Brannock, R.G., Litten, M.J. & Smith, J. (2000). The impact of doctoral study on marital satisfaction. *Journal of College Counseling*, 3, 123-130.
- Buehlman, K.T., Gottman, J.M., & Katz, L.F. (1992). How a Couple Views Their Past Predicts Their Future: Predicting Divorce from an Oral History Interview. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 5(3/4), 295-318.
- Burchinal, E.W. & Lee, R.N. (1957). Marital satisfaction and religious behavior. *Sociologist Review*, 22, 306-310.
- Burr, W.R. (1970). Satisfaction with various aspects of marriage over the life cycle: A random middle-class sample. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 32, 29-37.
- Buunk, B. P., Kluwer, E. S., Schuurman, M. K., & Siero, F. W. (2000). The division of labor among egalitarian and traditional women: Differences in discontent, social comparison, and false consensus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 759-779.
- Call, V.R.A. & Heaton, T.B. (1997). Religious influence on marital stability. *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 382-392.
- Carter, B. & McGoldrick, M. (Eds.) (2005). *The expanded family life cycle: Individual, family and social perspectives* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cherlin, A (1979). Work life and marital dissolution. In G. Levinger & O. C. Moles (Eds.), *Divorce and separation: Context, causes, and consequences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Christense, H.T. & Barber, K.E. (1967). Interfaith versus intrafaith marriage in Indiana. *of Marriage and the Family*, 29, 461-469.
- Clamar, A. (1991). Interfaith marriage: Defining the issues, treating the problems. *Psychotherapy in Private Practice*, 9, 79-83.
- Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1208-1233.

- Cowan, C.P. & Cowan, P.A. (1992). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cowan, C.P. & Cowan, P.A. (2000). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crohn, J. (1995). *Mixed matches: How to create successful interracial, interethnic, and interfaith relationships*. New York: Ballantine.
- Cubbins, L. A. & Vannoy, D. (2004). Division of household labor as a source of contention for married and cohabiting couples in metropolitan Moscow. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 182-215.
- Cummings, E.M., Goeke-Morey, M.C., Papp, L.M. & Dukewich. (2002). Children's response to mothers' and fathers' emotionality and tactics in marital conflict in the home. *Journal of Family Psychology*. Vol.16, No.4, 478-492.
- Cunningham, M. (2007). Influence of women's employment on the gendered division of household labor over the life course: Evidence from a 31-year panel study. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 422-444.
- Cunningham, M. (2005). Gender in cohabitation and marriage: The influence of gender Ideology on housework allocation over the life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 1037-1061.
- Curtis, K.T. & Elliso, C. (2002). Religious heterogamy and marital conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 551-576.
- Davila, J., Karney, B.R. & Bradbury, T.N (1999). Attachment change processes in the early years of marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 783-802.
- Dehle, C., Larsen, D. & Landers, J.E. (2001). Social support in marriage. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 29, 307-324.
- Demo, D.H. & Cox, M.J. Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 876-895.
- Dudley, M. G. & Kosinski, Jr., F.A. (1990). Religiosity and marital satisfaction: A research note. *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 32, No. 1.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- English, P. & Kalumba, K. M. (1996). *African Philosophy: A Classical Approach*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Ferre, M.M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 866-884.
- Ferre, M.M. (1991). The gender division of labor in two-earner marriages: Dimensions of variability and change. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 158-180.
- Fiese, B.H. & Tomcho, T.J. (2001). Finding meaning in religious practices: The relation between religious holiday rituals and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 597-609.
- Fincham, F.D. & Beach, S.R. (1999). Conflict in marriage: Implications for working with couples. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 47-77.
- Fowers, B.J. (2000). *Beyond the myth of marital happiness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fox, J.J. & Bartholomane, S. (2000). Economic stress and families. In P.C. Mckenry & S.J. Price (Eds.), *Families and change: Coping with stressful events and transitions* (2nd ed., pp. 250-278).
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1997). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 70, 325-335.
- Ganster, D. C., Fusilier, M. R., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). Role of social support in the experience of stress at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 102-110.
- Gerstein, L.H. & Russell, N. (1990). The experience of medical school: A major life crisis. *College Student Journal*, 24, 128-135.
- Giblin, P.R. (1997). Marital spirituality: A quantitative study. *Journal of Religion and Health*, Vol. 36, No. 4.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, L.J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A longitudinal view. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 47-52.
- Gottman, J. M., & Silver, N. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work*. New York: Crown Publishers.

- Greeff, A.P. & DeBruyne, T. (2000). Conflict management style and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 26:321-334.
- Greeff, A.P. & Malherbe, H.L. (2001). Intimacy and marital satisfaction in spouses. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 27:247-257.
- Greenstein, T.N. (1996). Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. *Social Forces*, 74, 1029-1042.
- Greenstein, T.N. (1996). Husbands' participation in domestic labor: Interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 58, 585-595.
- Grossman, C.L. (2002). "Study finds divorce more prevalent in interfaith homes." Retrieved July 18, 2007. (<http://the.onoluluadvertiser.com/article/2002/Dec/07/il/il14afaith.html>).
- Guttman, J. & Lazar, A. (2004). Criteria for marital satisfaction: Does having a child make a difference? *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 147-155.
- Hackel, L. S., & Ruble, D. N. (1992). Changes in the marital relationship after the first baby is born: Predicting the impact of expectancy disconfirmation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 944-957.
- Haddock, S. A., Zimmerman, T. Z., Ziemba, S. J., & Current, L. R. (2001). Ten adaptive strategies for work and family balance: Advice from successful families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27, 445-458.
- Hagedorn, L.S. (1999). Factor related to the retention of female graduate students over 30. *Journal of College Retention*, 1, 99-114.
- Hank, K. & Jurges, H. (2007). Gender and the division of household labor in older couples: A European perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 399-421.
- Hatfield, E. (1988). Passionate and compassionate love. In R. Sternberg & M. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 191-217). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heaton, T.B. & Pratt, E.L. (1990). The effects of religious homogamy on marital satisfaction and stability. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 191-207.
- Heller, P.E. (1998). The process of intimacy: Similarity, understanding and gender. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 68-84.

- Henry, R.G., Miller, R.B. & Giarrusso, R. (2005). Difficulties, disagreements, and disappointments in late-life marriages. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, Vol. 61, No. 3, 243 – 264.
- Higgs, P. (2003). African philosophy and the transformation of educational discourse in South Africa. *Journal of Education*, No. 30.
- Hinkley, K.R. (1986). *An interdisciplinary approach to the transition to parenthood*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International Dissertation Services.
- Horowitz, J.A. (1999). Negotiating couplehood: The process of resolving December dilemma among interfaith couples. *Family Process*, 38, 303-323.
- Huston, T. & Holmes, E.K. (2004). Becoming parents. In A. Vangelisti (Ed.), *Handbook of family communication* (pp. 105-133). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jansen, M., & Kalmijn, M. (2002). *Investments in family life: The impact of value Orientations on patterns of consumption, production and reproduction in married and cohabiting couples*. In R. Lesthaeghe (Ed.), *Meaning and choice: Value orientations and life course decisions* (pp. 129-159). The Hague/ Brussels: Nidi/CBGS.
- Jansen, M. & Liefbroer, A.C. (2006). Couples' attitudes, childbirth, and the division of labor. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 11, 1487-1511.
- Johnson, S. M. (2003). The revolution in couple therapy: A practitioner-scientist perspective. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 29, 365-384.
- Jonson, B.L., Duke, J.T., Eberley, S. & Sartain, D.H. (1988). Wives' employment status and marital happiness of religious couples. *Review of Religious Research*, 29 (3).
- Johnson, R., Hobfoll, S.E. & Zalcberg-Linetzy, A. (1993). Social support knowledge and behavior and relational intimacy: A dyadic study. *Journal of family Psychology*, 6266-277.
- Jose, O. & Alfons, V. (2007). Marital satisfaction, age, and gender. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 68-87.
- Kalmin, M. (1999). Father involvement in childrearing and the perceived stability of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 409-421.
- Kalmin, M. & Bernasco, W. (2001). Joint separate lifestyles in couple relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63, 639-654.

- Katz, J., Monnier, J., Libet, J., Shaw, D. & Beach, S.R. (2000). Individual and crossover effects of stress on adjustment in medical student marriages. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26, 341-351.
- Katz, L.F. & Woodin, E.M. (2002). Hostility, hostile, detachment, and conflict engagement in marriages: Effects on child and family functioning. *The Society for Research in Child Development, Inc.*
- Kaufman, G. & Taniguchi, H. (2006). Gender and marital happiness in later life. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, 6, 735-757.
- Kenny, D.A. & Acitelli, L.K. (1994). Similarity in couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 8(4), 417-431.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 472–503.
- Knoester, C. & Eggebeen, D.J. (2006). The effects of the transition to parenthood and subsequent children on men's well-being and social participation. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27 No. 11, 1532-1560.
- Knudson-Martin, C., & Mahoney, A. R. (1998). Language and processes in the construction of equality in new marriages. *Family Relations*, 47, 81-91.
- Kramer, B.J. & Kipnis, S. (1995). Eldercare and work-role conflict: Toward an understanding of gender differences in caregiver burden. *The Gerontologist*, 35, 340-348.
- Kulik, L. (1995). The impact of ethnic origin and gender on perceptions of gender roles: The Israeli experience. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 19(6), 199-214.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1999). The nature and predictors of trajectory of change in marital quality or husbands and wives over the the first 10 years of marriage. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1283-1296.
- Kurdek, L.A. (2005). Gender and marital satisfaction early in marriage: A growth curve approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 68-84.
- Larsen, K.S. & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex roles : Traditional or egalitarian? *Sex Roles*, 19, 1-12.
- Legako, M.A. & Sorenson, R.L. (2000). Christian psychology graduate school's impact on marriage : Nonstudent spouses speak. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28, 212-220.

- LaRossa, R. & Reitzes, D. (1993). Symbolic interactionism and family studies. In P.G. Boss, W.J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W.R. Schumm & S.K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods : A contextual approach* (pp. 135-). New York : Plenum.
- Levenson, R.W., Carstensen, L.L. & Gottman, J.M. (1993). Long-term marriages : Age, gender, and satisfaction. *Psychology and Aging*, 8, 301-313.
- Levenson, R.W., & Gottman, J.M. (1985). Physiological and affective predictors of change in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 85-94.
- Lin, Ying-Ching & Raghubir, P. (2005). Gender differences in unrealistic optimism about marriage and divorce: Are men more optimistic and women more realistic? *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 198-207.
- Lu, L. (2006). Postnatal adjustment of Chinese parents: A two-wave panel study in Taiwan. *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 41 (5), 371-384.
- Macdoland, D.S. (1996). Notes on the socioeconomic and cultural factors influencing the of HIV in Botswana. *Social Science and Medicine*, 42, 1325-1333.
- MacLean, A.P. & Peters, R.D. (1995). Graduate student couples: Dyadic satisfaction in relation to type of partnership and demographic characteristics. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 27, 120-124.
- McLaughlin, M.C. (1985). Graduate school and families: Issues for academic departments and university mental health professionals. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 488-491.
- Masolo, D.A. (1994). *African philosophy in search of identity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Maundeni, T. (2002). Wife abuse among a sample of divorced women in Botswana: A research note . *Violence against Women*, Vol. 8 No.2, 257-274.
- Mbiti, J.S. (1990). *African religions and philosophy* (2nd ed.).Great Britain: Richard Clay Ltd.
- McGoldrick, M. (1988). The joining of families through marriage: The new couple. In B. Carter & M. McGoldrick, (Eds.), *The changing family life cycle: A framework for therapy* (pp. 209-233). New York: Gardner.
- McGonagle, K.A. Kessler, R.C. & Schilling, E.A. (1992). The frequency and determinants of marital disagreements in a community sample. *Journal of Social Personal Relationships*, 9 507-524.

- Mead, G. H. (1922). A behavioristic account of the significant symbol. *Journal of Philosophy*, 19, 157-163.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meeks, S., Murrell, S.A. & Mehl, R.C. (2000). Longitudinal relationships between depressive symptoms and health in normal older and middle-aged adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 15(1), 100-109.
- Menagham, E. (1983) "Marital stress and family transitions: A panel analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 45, 371-386.
- Mennino, S.F. & Brayfield, A. (2002). Job-family trade-offs. *Work and Occupation*, Vol. 29 No. 2, 226-256.
- Michaels, G.Y. & Goldberg, W.A. (1988). *The transition to parenthood: Current theory and research*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mickelson, K.D., Claffey, T.C. & Williams, K.D. (2006). The moderating role of gender and gender role attitudes on the link between spousal support and marital quality. *Sex Roles*, 55:73-82.
- Miller, R.B., Hemaseth, K.K. & Nelson, B.K. (1997). Marriage in middle and later life. In R.D. Hargrave & S.M. Hanna (Eds.), *The aging family: New vision in theory, practice, and reality* (pp. 178-198). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Miller, N.B. & Kanna, L.A. (1999). Predicting marital quality in Ghana. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 30.
- Mookodi, G., Ntshebe, O. & Taylor, I. (2004). The Continuum Complete International Encyclopedia of Sexuality: Botswana.
- Murray, S.L., Bellavia, G.M., Rose, P., & Griffin, D.W. (2003). Once hurt, twice hurtful: How perceived regard regulates daily marital interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (1), 126-147
- Norton, L.S., Thomas, S., Morgan, K., Tilley, A. & Dickens, T.E. (1998). Full-time studying and long-term relationships: Make or break for mature students? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 26, 75-88.
- Orbuch, T.L., House, J.S., Mero, R.P. & Webster, P.S. (1996). Marital quality over life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 59, No. 2, 162-171.

- O'Rourke, N. (2005). Personality, cognitive adaptation, and marital satisfaction as predictors of well-being among older married adults. *Canadian Journal on Aging*, 24(3), 211-224.
- Osei, G.K. (1971). *The African philosophy of life*. London: The African Publication Society.
- Osler, M. (1998). The food intake of smokers and nonsmokers: The role of partner's smoking behavior. *Preventive Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice and Theory*, 27, 438-443.
- Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., & Godshalk, V. M. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 275-300.
- Pimentel, E.E. (2006). Gender ideology, household behavior, and backlash in urban China. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 341-365.
- Pleck, J.H. (1985). *Working wives/working husbands*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Prager, K.J. (1995). *The psychology of intimacy*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Press, J., Fagan, J. & Bernd, E. (2006). Child care, work, and depressive symptoms among low-income mothers. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 5, 609-632.
- Purdom, C.L., Lucas, J.L. & Miller, K. (2006). *North American Journal of Psychology*, Vol.8, No. 1, 1-12.
- Qadir, F., De Silva, P., Prince, M. & Khan, M. (2005). Marital satisfaction in Pakistan: A pilot investigation. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 195-207.
- Rabin, C. & Rahav, G. (1995). Differences and similarities between younger and older marriages across cultures: A comparison of American and Israeli retired non-marriages. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 23, 237-249.
- Rexroat, C. (1985). Women's work expectations and labor-market experience in early and middle family life-cycle. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 131-142.
- Rogers, S. J. & Amato, P.R. (1997). Is marital quality declining? The evidence from two generations. *Social Forces*, 75, 1089-1100.
- Rogers, S. J. & Amato, P.R. (2000). Have changes in gender relations affected marital quality? *Social Forces*, 79, 731-753.

- Roxburgh, S. (2006). "I wish we had more time to spend together..." The distribution and predictors of perceived family time pressures among married men and women in paid labor force. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 529-553.
- Sager, C. & Hunt, B. (1979). *Intimate partners: Hidden patterns in love relationships*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schaefer, M.T. & Olson, D.H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 7, 47-60.
- Scheinkman, M. (1988). Graduate student marriages: An organizational/interactional view. *Family Process*, 27, 351-368.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2002). A meta-analysis of sex differences in romantic attraction: Do rating contexts moderate tactic effectiveness judgments? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 387-402.
- Schneider, S.W. (1989). *Intermarriage: The challenge of living with with differences between Chriatians and Jews*. New York: Free Press.
- Schoen, R., Rogers, S.J. & Amato, P.R. (2006). Wives' employment and spouses' marital happiness: assessing the direction of influence using longitudinal couple data. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 506-528.
- Schulz, M.S., Cowan, P.A., Pape, C.C. & Brennan, R.T. (2004). Coming home upset: Gender, marital satisfaction, and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(1), 250-263.
- Schuster, T., Kessler, R.C. & Aseltine, R.H., Jr. (1990). Supportive interactions, negative interactions, and depressed mood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 423-437.
- Shapiro, M. (2007). Money: A therapeutic tool for couples' therapy. *Family Process*, Vol.46, Issue 3, 279-291.
- Shapiro, A.F., Gottman, J.M. & Carrere, S. (2000). The baby and the marriage: Identifying factors that buffer against decline in marital satisfaction after the first baby arrives. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14 59-70.
- Shelton, B.A. & John, D. (1996). The division of household labor. *Annuual Review of Sociology*, 22, 299-322.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (2001). Evolution and relationships: A call for integration. *Personal Relationships*, 8, 341-355.

- Singley, S.G. & Hynes, K. (2005). Transition to parenthood: Work-family policies, gender, and the couple context. *Gender & Society*, Vol. 19 No. 3, 376-397.
- Sori, C.F., Wetchler, J.L. Ray, R. E. & Niedner, D.M. (1996). The impact of marriage and family therapy graduate training program on married students and their families. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 24, 259-268.
- Sousa, L.A. (1995). Interfaith and the individual and family life cycle. *Family Therapy*, 22, 97-104.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 38:15–28.
- Pence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Spitz, G. & Loscocco, K.A. (2000). The labor of Sisyphus? Women's and men's reactions to housework. *Social Science Quarterly*, Vo.81, No.
- Spitze, G.D. (1981). "Wives' employment: The role of husbands' perceived attitudes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 117-124.
- Stanley, S. M. & Einhorn, L.A. (2007). Hitting pay dirt: Comment on "Money: A therapeutic tool for couples therapy". *Family Process*, Vol. 46, Issue 3, 293-299.
- Stanley, S.M., Markman, H.J., & Whitton, S. (2002). Communication, conflict, and commitment: Insights on the foundations of relationship success from a national survey. *Family Process*, 41, 659–675.
- Steil, J. (1997). Marital equality: *Its relationship to the well-being of husbands and wives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Steinberg, R. (1987). The triangle of love: *Intimacy, passion, commitment*. New York: Basic.
- Steinberg, L. & Silverberg, S.B. (1987). Influences on marital satisfaction during the middle stages of the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 49, 751-760.
- Stevens, D.P., Minnotte, K.L., Mannon, S.E. & Kiger, G. (2006). Family work performance and satisfaction: Gender ideology, relative resources, and emotional work. *Marriage & Family Review*, Vol. 40(4).
- Storaasli, R.D., & Markman, H.J. (1990). Relationship problems in the early stages of marriage: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 4, 80–98.

- Story, L.B., & Bradbury, T.N. (2004). Understanding marriage and stress: Essential questions and challenges. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23, 1139–1162.
- Strong, B., DeVault, C. & Sayad, B. (1998). *The marriage and family experience: Intimate relationships in a changing society*. U.S.A.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Suitor, J.J. (1991). Marital quality and satisfaction with the division of household labor across the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 53, No.1, 221-230.
- Thompson, L. (1993). Conceptualizing gender in marriage: The case of marital care. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 557-569.
- Thorstad, R.R., Anderson, T.L., Hall, M. E.L., Willingham, M. & Carruthers, L. (2006). Breaking the mold: A qualitative exploration of mothers in Christian academia and their experience of spousal support. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 229-251.
- Val Wel, F. & Knijn, T. (2006). Transitional phase or a new balance? Working and caring by mothers with young children in the Netherlands. *Journal of Family Issue*, Vol. 27, No.5, 633-651.
- Van Hook, M.P. (1994). The Impact of Economic and Social Changes on the Roles of Women in Botswana and Zimbabwe.
- Vandervorst, J. (2000). Het Verband tussen de huwelijksatisfactie en de huwelijksduur: een Literatuuroverzicht (The association between marital satisfaction and length of marriage: A literature overview). Unpublished licentiate thesis, Katholieke University Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.
- Vannoy, D. & Philliber, W.W. (1992). Wife's employment and quality of marriage. *Marriage and the Family*, 54, 387-398.
- Vernon, G.M. (1960). Interfaith marriages. *Religious Education*, 55, 261-264.
- Waring, E.M. (1988). *Enhancing marital intimacy through cognitive self-disclosure*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Waring, E.M., Carver, C.M., Stalker, C.A. & Gitta, M.Z. (1981). Waiting-list controlled trial of cognitive marital therapy in severe marital discord. *Journal of Marital Therapy*, 17, 243-256.
- Whiffen, V.E., Kerr, M.A. & Kallos-Lilly, V. (2005). Maternal depression, adult attachment, and children's emotional distress. *Family Process*, Vol. 44, No. 1, 93-103.

- Williams, L.M. & Lawler, M.G. (2000). The challenges and rewards of interchurch marriages. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 19, 205-218.
- Wiredu, K. (1980). *Philosophy and an African culture*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Wiredu, K. & Gyekye, K. (1992). *Person and community: Ghanaian philosophical studies I*. Washington, D.C. 20064 : The Council of Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Wynne, L.C. & Wynne, A.R. (1986). The quest for intimacy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 12, 383-394.
- Xu, X. & Lai, S. (2004). Gender ideologies, marital roles, and marital quality in Taiwan. *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 318-355.
- Yeh, H., Lorenz, F. O., Wickrama, K.A.S., Conger, R.D. & Elder, G.H. (2006). among sexual satisfaction, marital quality, and marital instability at midlife. *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 339-343.
- Yodanis, C. (2005). Divorce Culture and Marital Gender Equality: A Cross-National Study. *Gender Society*, 19(5): 644 - 659.
- Yorgason, J. B., Almeida, D. A., Neupert, S.D., Shevaun, D. N., Avron Spiro III, A & Hoffman, L. (2006). A Dyadic Examination of Daily Health Symptoms and Emotional Well-Being in Late-Life Couples. *Family Relations*, 55, 613-624.
- Young, M.E. & Long, L.L. (1998). *Counseling and therapy for couples*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Zimmerman, T. S., Haddock, S. A., Ziemba, S., & Rust, A. (2001). *Family Organizational labor: Who is calling the plays*. In T. S. Zimmerman (Ed.), *Balancing family and work: Special considerations in feminist therapy?* (pp. 65-90). New York: Haworth Press.
- Zipp, J. F., Prohaska, A. & Bemiller, M. (2004). Wives, Husbands, and Hidden Power in Marriage. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25(7): 933 - 958.

Appendix A

Introduction

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is (name of a team member). I am part of a team that is carrying out a study about marital satisfaction and closeness in Botswana. The purpose of this study is to ask married people about their life experiences in regards to marital life in areas such as education, friends, finances, religion, presence of children and employment status. It is hoped that the findings of this study will help to develop effective programs to improve marital quality of married individuals and also to help prepare those who would be thinking about getting married.

This study is being carried out by a student from Loma Linda University, California, at the United States of America, to fulfill one of his requirements for Ph.D. in Marital and Family Therapy. Your participation will involve reading the consent form and completing the survey questions which I will give to you. It is estimated that it will take you approximately 30 to 35 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. With your consent, I will leave the questions and come back in a week's time to collect the answers.

Appendix B

Informed Consent

Marital Satisfaction and Intimacy in Botswana: A Quantitative Study Loma Linda University Department of Counseling and Family Sciences

Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study to examine marital satisfaction and closeness among married people in Botswana. This study is being carried out by a student from Loma Linda University, California, at the United States of America, to fulfill one of his requirements for a doctoral degree in Marital and Family Therapy. The project is overseen by Doctoral level Faculty at Loma Linda University within the Department of Counseling and Family Sciences. Your participation will involve reading and signing the consent form and completing the attached survey questions.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain insight and knowledge into how married individuals look at marital satisfaction and closeness. As a married person, your responses to the questions, together with those of others, will help to develop effective programs to improve marital quality of married individuals and to help prepare those planning to get married.

Procedures

With your consent, you will fill out the questionnaires either at home or at any other convenient place. The questionnaires ask your marital experience in areas of marital satisfaction and intimacy. It is estimated that it will take you approximately 30 to 35 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. With your consent, I will leave the questions and come back in a week's time to collect the answers. This is what you will be asked to do if you participate:

- 1) Reading and signing this consent form
- 2) Filling out the questionnaires
- 3) Returning the questionnaires to the investigator

Risks

Some of the questions asked may be personal and may cause some minimal discomfort. However, you may quit at any time if you feel very uncomfortable with the questions. Below is the name of a counseling clinic should you need any one to talk to regarding the discomfort from answering the questions in this study.

Benefits

There are no benefits to you in regards to money or rewards. However, you may become aware of things that are important for you to do, or address, to feel better about your marriage life by having answered the questions. Furthermore, the data gathered in this study will be used to understand the needs of married people in future pre-marital and marriage counseling.

Voluntary

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to not participate in the study and to withdraw from filling in the survey at any time.

Confidentiality

All information you share is confidential, which means the signed consent form will be separated from the filled in survey questions. No names or identifying information will be recorded on the survey sheets; the

information collected will be anonymous. Upon completion, your answers to the survey will be placed in a locked cabinet to be accessed by the investigator.

Additional Costs

There is no cost to you for participating in this study. However, will you need counseling due to getting discomfort from answering the questions; you will be responsible for seeing a counselor.

Reimbursement

There is no reimbursement or inducements for participating in this study.

To Contact the Investigators

If you have questions or concerns and you need to get hold of the investigators, you can call the local research team leader, Lame Mokotedi at 72666648, for assistance.

Impartial Third Party Contact

If you wish to contact an impartial third party not associated with this study regarding any question or complaint you may have about the study, you may contact the Botswana Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs at telephone number 3914697 for information and assistance.

Referral

Due to the nature of survey questions, you may experience emotional discomfort or new awareness of interpersonal issues. If you should chose, you may pursue counseling services at:

South Botswana Conference
Counseling Centre
Mogoditshane
3973639

By signing below, I give my informed consent to participate in this research project.

Signature of Participant

Date

Appendix C

Instructions

You will be answering five sets of questions: (a) the Demographic Sheet, (b) Dyadic Adjustment Scale and from, (c) the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory, (d). The Demographic Sheet has 19 items, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale has 32 items and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory has 36 items. As you will see, most items have 5 possible responses ranging from “Always agree to Never agree,” “All the time to never,” “Strongly agree to Strongly disagree” and son on. You are to fill in the cycle (0) which best describes the way that you feel about your marital experience at this time.

Please, answer all of the questions on the three questioners. Do not make any other marks on the sheet or write your name anywhere on the survey so that your identity is not known. Take as much time as you need. I will collect the answer sheets after you are done.

Appendix D
Demographic Questionnaire

Instructions: Please circle/fill in your responses. For the results to be used, you must answer all questions.

1. Gender: male female
2. When were you born? Month _____ Year _____
3. When was your spouse born? Month _____ Year _____
4. When did you get married to you spouse? Month _____ Year _____
5. What is your religious affiliation (such as Catholic, Baptist, SDA, Lutheran, etc, or none)? _____
6. What is your spouse's religious affiliation? _____
7. How often do you attend services at your church?
☐ More than once a week ☐ At least once a week ☐ Two or three times a month
☐ Once every month ☐ Less than once a month
8. How often does you family have family worship?
☐ Twice daily ☐ Once daily ☐ At least once a week ☐ Less than weekly ☐ Seldom
9. What is your occupation? (Such as Clerical, Laborer, Homemaker, Professional, and Self-employed, University/college student, Retired) _____
10. What is your spouse's occupation? _____
11. What is the highest level of formal education you have received thus far?"
☐ Primary education ☐ Junior Secondary ☐ Form Five ☐ Certificate
☐ Diploma ☐ College graduate ☐ BA/BS/LLB ☐ Graduate degree.

12. What is your spouse's highest level of education? _____

13. What is your annual household income (for both Husband and wife, after taxes)?

14. For how long have you lived in Gaborone? _____

15. How many children do you have? _____

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
16. Your children's gender: Male or Female (M or F)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. How old are your children?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. Are your children living in the home (Yes or No)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Appendix E

Gender Role Attitudes

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Most of the important decisions for the family should be made by the man of the house.	0	0	0	0	0
2. It is perfectly alright for women to be very active in clubs, politics, and other outside activities before the children are grown up.	0	0	0	0	0
3. There is some work that is men's and some that is women's, and they should not be doing each other's work.	0	0	0	0	0
4. A wife should not expect her husband to help around the house after he comes home from a hard day's work.	0	0	0	0	0
5. A working mother can have just as good a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.	0	0	0	0	0
6. It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family.	0	0	0	0	0
7. Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.	0	0	0	0	0
8. It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have one herself.	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix F

Spousal Support

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. My partner cares about me.	0	0	0	0	0
2. My partner asks me regularly about my day.	0	0	0	0	0
3. My partner accepts me completely.	0	0	0	0	0
4. When I have a tough day, my partner tries to cheer me up.	0	0	0	0	0
5. When I am frustrated, my partner listens to me.	0	0	0	0	0
6. My partner is sympathetic when I am upset.	0	0	0	0	0
7. when I am tired after a demanding day, my partner is willing to help at home.	0	0	0	0	0
8. Who spends more time taking care of responsibilities at home?	I do	My partner	Both equal		

Appendix G

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Instructions: Most people have disagreements in their marriages. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list. Mark choices by filling in the circles, 0.

	Always Agree	Almost always agree	Sometimes agree	Hardly ever agree	Never agree
1. Handling family matters	0	0	0	0	0
2. Matters of recreation	0	0	0	0	0
3. Religious matters	0	0	0	0	0
4. Demonstration of affection	0	0	0	0	0
5. Friends	0	0	0	0	0
6. Sex relations	0	0	0	0	0
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	0	0	0	0	0
8. Philosophy of life	0	0	0	0	0
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	0	0	0	0	0
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	0	0	0	0	0
11. Amount of time spent together	0	0	0	0	0
12. Making major decisions	0	0	0	0	0
13. Household tasks	0	0	0	0	0
14. Leisure time, interests and activities	0	0	0	0	0
15. Career decisions	0	0	0	0	0

	All the time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Hardly ever	Never
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce or separation?	0	0	0	0	0
17. How often do you or your spouse leave the house after an argument?	0	0	0	0	0
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your spouse are going well?	0	0	0	0	0
19. Do you confide in your spouse?	0	0	0	0	0
20. Do you ever regret that you married your spouse?	0	0	0	0	0
21. How often do you and your spouse quarrel?	0	0	0	0	0
22. How often do you and your spouse really annoy each other?	0	0	0	0	0
How often:	Every day	Almost every day	Sometimes	Hardly ever	Never
23. Do you kiss your spouse?	0	0	0	0	0
24. Do you and your spouse engage in outside interests together?	0	0	0	0	0
How often do you:	At least once day	Once or twice a week	Once or twice a month	Less than once a month	Never
25. Have an interesting conversation?	0	0	0	0	0
26. Laugh together?	0	0	0	0	0
27. Calmly discuss something?	0	0	0	0	0
28. Work together on a project?	0	0	0	0	0

Indicate if the items below were problems in your marriage during the past FEW WEEKS by filling in a circle for YES or NO.

29. Being too tired for sex 0 No 0 Yes

30. Not showing love 0 No 0 Yes

31. Please fill in one circle that best describes the degree of happiness in your marriage.

0Very unhappy 0Somewhat unhappy 0Fairly happy 0Mostly happy 0Very happy

32. Which one of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your marriage (Please fill in the circle for the most appropriate statement)?

- 0 I want desperately for my marriage to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.
- 0 I want very much for my marriage to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.
- 0 I want very much for my marriage to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.
- 0 It would be nice if my marriage succeeded, but I can't do much more than I'm doing now to help it succeed.
- 0 My marriage can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the marriage going.

Appendix H

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory

Instructions: Please mark response by filling in the circles (0) according to how you feel about your marriage at present. For the results to be used, you must answer all the questions.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to.	0	0	0	0	0
2. We enjoy spending time with other couples.	0	0	0	0	0
3. I am satisfied with our sex life.	0	0	0	0	0
4. My partner helps me clarify my Thoughts.	0	0	0	0	0
5. We enjoy the same recreational Activities.	0	0	0	0	0
6. My partner has all of the qualities I've always wanted in a mate.	0	0	0	0	0
7. I can state my feelings without Him/her getting defensive.	0	0	0	0	0
8. We usually "keep to ourselves."	0	0	0	0	0
9. I feel our sexual activity is just routine.	0	0	0	0	0
10. When it comes to having a Serious discussion, it seems we Have little in common.	0	0	0	0	0
11. I share in few of my partner's Interests.	0	0	0	0	0
12. There are times when I do not					

Feel a great deal of love and Affection for my partner.	0	0	0	0	0
13. I often feel distant from my partner.	0	0	0	0	0
14. We have few friends in common.	0	0	0	0	0
15. I am able to tell my partner when I want sexual intercourse.	0	0	0	0	0
16. I feel “put-down” in a serious conversation with my partner.	0	0	0	0	0
17. We like playing together.	0	0	0	0	0
18. Every new thing I have learned about my partner has pleased me.	0	0	0	0	0
19. My partner can really understand my hurts and joys.	0	0	0	0	0
20. Having time together with friends is an important part of our shared activities.	0	0	0	0	0
21. I “hold back” my sexual interest Because my partner makes me feel Uncomfortable.	0	0	0	0	0
22. I feel it is useless to discuss some things with my partner.	0	0	0	0	0
23. We enjoy the out-of-doors together.	0	0	0	0	0
24. My partner and I understand each other completely.	0	0	0	0	0
25. I feel neglected at times by Partner.	0	0	0	0	0
26. Many of partner’s closest friends are also my closest friends.	0	0	0	0	0

27. Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship.	0	0	0	0	0
28. My partner frequently tries to change my ideas.	0	0	0	0	0
29. We seldom find time to do fun things together.	0	0	0	0	0
30. I don't think anyone could be possibly be happier than my partner and I when we are with one another.	0	0	0	0	0
31. I sometimes feel lonely when we're together.	0	0	0	0	0
32. My partner disapproves of some of my friends.	0	0	0	0	0
33. My partner seems disinterested in sex. Religious matters	0	0	0	0	0
34. We have an endless number of things to talk about.	0	0	0	0	0
35. I feel we share some of the same interests.	0	0	0	0	0
36. I have some needs that are not being met by my marriage.	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix I

Setswana Version of the Questionnaire

Tsekatsheko: Go Itumela le go Itsanye mo go tseneletseng gareng ga
Banyalani mo Botswana

Loma Linda University Department of Counseling and Family Sciences

Fomo ya go dumela go araba dipotso

Re go lebogela boithaopo jwa gago go tsenelela dipatlisiso tse tsa goitumela mo lenyalong le go itsanye mo go tseneletseng mo banyalaning mo Botswana. Go tsaya karolo ga gago go tla akaretsa go araba dipotso tsotlhe gore re tshaloganye botoka ditshetlha tse di tsisang boitumelo mo lenyalong le kitsano e e tseneletseng mo banyalaning. Dipatlisiso tse, di okametswe ke ba lephata la baithuti ba manyalo le malwapa ko sekolong sa Loma Linda University.

Maikaelelo

Maikaelelo a dipatlisiso tse ke go phuta dikitso ka tsela e banyalani ba ikutlwang ka teng ka boitumelo mo lenyalong le go itsanye mo go tseneletseng mo banyalaning.

Boithaopo

Go nna le seabe mo dipatlisisong tse, ke boithaopo fela. O na le tshwanelo ya go tlhoka go araba dipotso le go emisa boithaopo jwa gago nako ngwe le nngwe.

Sephiri

Dikgang tsotlhe tse o di abalanang le rona di tlaa nna sephiri. Se se raya gore fa o ikwala mo fomong e ya tumalano, leina la gago ga le kitla le tlhakangwa le fomo ya dikarabo tsa tshekatsheko. Kitso yotlhe e re tla e bonang mo dikarabong tsa gago ke sephiri ebile ga e kitla e dirisiwa gope gape. Maloko a setlhophla sa tshekatsheko e, ke bone fela ba tlaa bonang dikarabo tsa gago.

Tlhagiso le kgakololo

Ka ntlha ya seemo sa dipotso tsa tshekatsheko e, o kanna wa amega maikutlo kgotsa wa lemoga sesha dikgang tse di amanang le lenyalo la gago. O ka itlhophela gore o bone thuso kgotsa kgakololo kwa;

South Botswana Conference
Counseling Center
Mogoditshane
3973639

Ke tshaloganya go tsaya karolo ga me mo patlisisong e, ebile ke letlelela gore dikarabo tsame di dirisiwe mo patlisisong e.

Leina (motsaya karolo)

Letsatsi

Monwana wa motsaya karolo (signature)

Letsatsi

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Ditaelo: Tshwaa dikarabo tsa gago ka botlalo. Gore maduo a kgone go dirisiwa, o tshwanetse go araba dipotso tsotlhe.

1. Bong: Rre Mme
2. O tshotswe leng? Kgwedi _____ Ngwaga _____
3. Rre/Mme wa gago o tshotswe leng? Kgwedi _____ Ngwaga _____
4. O nyetse/nyetswe leng? Kgwedi _____ Ngwaga _____
5. O tsena kereke/phuthego efe? (Sekai; Lutere, Roma jalo jalo, kgotsa ga o tsene kereke)? _____
6. Rre/Mme wa gago o tsena kereke efe? _____
7. O tsena kereke ga kae?

☐ Gangwe ka beke 0 Go feta gangwe ka beke 0 Gangwe kgotsa ga
bedi ka kgwedi ☐ Gangwe ka kgwedi 0 Eseng go feta gangwe ka kgwedi
8. Ba lelwapa la gago ba obama ga kae mo lwapeng?

0 Gangwe ka letsatsi 0 Gabedi ka letsatsi 0 Gangwe ka beke 0 Eseng go feta
bongwe ka beke 0 Eseng gantsi
9. O bereka o le eng? (sekai; mokwaledi, o a ipereka, o tsena sekolo, o tlogetse tiro ka bogodi) _____
10. Rre/Mme o bereka/dira e le eng? _____

11. O tsenye sekolo go ema fa kae?

0 Sekolo se se botlana 0 Sekolo se segolwane 0 Maemo a botlhano mo
sekolong se segolwane (Form Five) 0 Certificate 0 Diploma 0 College
graduate 0 BA/BS/LLB 0 Graduate degree.

12. Rre/Mme wa gago o tsene sekolo go ema fa kae? _____

13. Tuelo/kamogelo ya madi a lapa la gago ke bokae ka ngwaga, morago ga lekgetho?
(ya ga mme le rre di kopanye)? _____

14. O na le sebaka se se kae o nna mo Gaborone? _____

15. O na le bana ba le kae? _____

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
16. Bong jwa bana: Monna kgotsa Mosadi (M or F)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Bana ba dingwaga di kae?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. A bana ba nna mo lapeng? (Ee kgotsa nyaa)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Ditaelo: Batho ba le bantsi bana le go tlhoka kutlwisisanyo mo nyalong. Tswee tswee araba ka botlalo dintlha tse di supang kutlwisisanyo kgotsa go tlhoka kutlwisisanyo ya gago le rre/mme wag ago. Supa ka lotshwao (×) kakanyetso tsa gago.

	Re dumalana Nako yotlhe	Eseng nako yotlhe	nakon ngwe	ga se gantsi re dumalana	ga reke re dumalana
1. Dikgang tsa mo lwapeng	0	0	0	0	0
2. Dikgang tsa boitapoloso	0	0	0	0	0
3. Dikgang tsa tumelo	0	0	0	0	0
4. Go supa maikutlo a lorato	0	0	0	0	0

5. Ditsala	0	0	0	0	0
6. Tsa tlhakanelo dikobo	0	0	0	0	0
7. Tsa boitshwaro jo bo letlelesegang	0	0	0	0	0
8. Dikakanyetso tsa botshelo ka bophara	0	0	0	0	0
9. Tirisanyo le batsadi	0	0	0	0	0
10. Maikemisetso a botshelo (dilo tse di botlhokwa)	0	0	0	0	0
11. Nako e lo e nnang mmogo (mme le rre)	0	0	0	0	0
12. Go dira ditshwetso tse dikgolo	0	0	0	0	0
13. Ditiro tsa molwapeng	0	0	0	0	0
14. Nako tsa go i itumedisa	0	0	0	0	0
15. Tsa thuto le tiro	0	0	0	0	0

	Nako yotlhe	Gantsi	Nako ngwe	le faele	Ga go ise go diragale
16. Ke ga kae o akanya ka go kgaogana/tlhalo?	0	0	0	0	0
17. Ke ga kae rre/mme a tswa mo lwapeng morago ga go tlhoka kwutlisisanyo?	0	0	0	0	0
18. Ka kakaretso, ke ga kae dilo di siame fa gare ga gago le rre/mme?	0	0	0	0	0
19. A o bolelela rre/mme diphiri/ matswenyego a gago?	0	0	0	0	0
20. A o tle o ikwatlhaele go nyala/ nyalwa ke rre/mme wag ago?	0	0	0	0	0
21. Ke ga kae o omana le rre/mme Wa gago?	0	0	0	0	0
22. Ke ga kae lo tenyana thata?	0	0	0	0	0

Ke ga kae o?	Tsatsi le letsatsi	go tsamaela letsatsi le letsatsi	Nako ngwe	ga se gantsi	ga go diragale
23. A o suna rre/mme wa gago?	0	0	0	0	0
24. A lo a tle lo tswela ntle le rre/mme wa gago mmogo?	0	0	0	0	0

Ke ga kae lo:	Gangwe ka letsatsi	Gangwe / gabedi ka beke	Gangwe / gabedi ka kgwedi	ko tlase ga bongwe ka kgwedi	Ganke
25. Lo nna le kgang e e kgatlhisang ?	0	0	0	0	0
26. Tshega mmogo?	0	0	0	0	0
27. Buisanya sengwe mmogo?	0	0	0	0	0
28. Dira sengwe mmogo?	0	0	0	0	0

Supa fa tse di latelang e kile ya nna mathata mo lenyalong la lona mo dibekeng tse di sa tswang go feta ka goupa ka EE kgotsa NNYAA.

29. O lapile thata go ka tlhakanela dikobo 0 Nyaa 0 Ee

30. O sa supe lorato 0 Nyaa 0 Ee

31. Tlatsa kgolokwe e e tlhalosang selekanyetso sa boitumelo mo lenyalong la lona.

0 Ga ke itumele gotlhelele 0 Ga ke itumele thata 0 Ke itumele sentle 0 Ke itumela thata 0 Ke itumela thata thata

32. Ke sefe seele sa tse dilatelang se se tlhalosang maikutlo a gago ka bokamoso jwa lenyalo la gago (Goloka karabo)

- 1 Ke eletsa thata gore lenyalo lame le atlege, ebile ke ka dira sengwe le sengwe go bona gore le atlega.
- 2 Ke eletsa thata gore lenyalo lame le atlege , ebile ke tlaa dira gotlhe mo ke ka go kgonang go bona le atlega.
- 3 Ke eletsa thata gore lenyalo lame le atlege, ebile ke tlaa dira seabe sa me go dira gore le atlege.

- 4 Go ka itumedisa thata fa lenyalo lwama lo ka atlega, mme ga ke kake ka dira go feta mo ke go dirang jaanong go le thusa go atlega.
- 5 Lenyalo lame ga le kake la atlega ebile ga ke kake ka kgona go dira sepe go le tsweledisa.

PERSONAL ASSESSMENT OF INTIMACY IN RELATIONSHIPS INVENTORY

Ditaelo: Tswee tswee supa ka lotswao (×) go supa maikutlo a gago ka lenyalo la gago mo nakong ya gompiano. Gore maduo a kgone go dirisiwa o tshwanetse go araba dipotso tsotlhe.

	Ke dumalana thata	ke a dumalana	ke fa gare	Ga ke dumele thata	Ga ke dumele
1. Mokapelo wame o a ntheetsa fa ke tlhoka yo ke ka buang le ene	0	0	0	0	0
2. Re rata go itisa le banyalani ba Bangwe	0	0	0	0	0
3. Ke itumelela tlhakanelo dikobo ga Rona	0	0	0	0	0
4. Mokapelo wame o nthuso go tlhalosa dikakanyo tsame	0	0	0	0	0
5. Re rata dilo tsa itloso budutu tse di tshwanang	0	0	0	0	0
6. Mokapelo wame o na le ditshetla tshotlhe tse ke saleng ke di batlang mo Mokapelong	0	0	0	0	0
7. Ke ka bua maikutlo a me a sa Galefe	0	0	0	0	0
8. Gantsi re a itidimalela	0	0	0	0	0
9. Ke ikutlwa e kare tlhakanelo dikobo ya rona ke tiro fela	0	0	0	0	0
10. Fa re bua ka kgang e e tlhoafetseng go bonala re sa dumalane ka sepe	0	0	0	0	0
11. Ke rata dikgatlhego dingwe tsa mokapelo	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ka dinako dingwe ga ke rate mokapelo wa me thata	0	0	0	0	0
13. Gantsi ke ikutlwa ke le kgakala le mokapelo wame	0	0	0	0	0

14. Re na le ditsala tse re di tlananetseng di se dintsi	0	0	0	0	0
15. Ke kgona go bolelela mokapelo fa ke batla re tlhakanela dikobo	0	0	0	0	0
16. Ke ikutlwa ke nyadiwa fa re buisana ka kgang e e tlhoafetseng	0	0	0	0	0
17. Re rata go tshameka rotlhe	0	0	0	0	0
18. Sengwe le sengwe se sencha se ke se ithutileng ka mokapelo wame se intumedisitse	0	0	0	0	0
19. Mokapelo wame o tlhaloganya dikutlobotlhoko le boitumelo jwa me	0	0	0	0	0
20. Go nna le nako le ditsala tsa rona ke tshetla e e botlhokwa ya go itlosa bodutu mmogo	0	0	0	0	0
23. Re rata go iphokisa phefo rotlhe	0	0	0	0	0
24. Nna le mokapelo wame re a tlhaloganyana	0	0	0	0	0
25. Ka dinako tse dingwe ke ikutlwa ke kgaphwetswe ko thoko ke mokapelo wame	0	0	0	0	0
26. Bontsi jwa ditsala tse ditona tsa mokapelo wame ke ditsala tsa me	0	0	0	0	0
27. Go supa maikutlo a thobalano ke tshetla e tona ya botsalano jwa rona	0	0	0	0	0
28. Mokapelo wame gantsi o leka go fetola maikutlo kgotsa maano ame	0	0	0	0	0
29. Ga se gantsi re bona nako ya go tshameka rotlhe	0	0	0	0	0
30. Ga ke bone fa go na le bobedi bope jo bo itumelang go re gaisa fa kena le mokapelo wame	0	0	0	0	0
31. Nako tse dingwe ke jewa ke bodutu le fa kena le mokapelo wa me	0	0	0	0	0
32. Mokapelo wa me ga a rate dingwe tsa ditsala tsa me	0	0	0	0	0
33. Mokapelo wa me o lebega a sena kgatlhego mo go tsa tlhakanelo dikobo	0	0	0	0	0
34. Re na le dilo tse dintsi thata tse re ka buang ka tsone	0	0	0	0	0

35. Ke dumela fa re rata dilo tse di tshwanang ka bontsi	0	0	0	0	0
36. Ke na le ditlhoko dingwe tse di sa kgotsofatsegeng mo lenyalong	0	0	0	0	0

Gender Role Attitudes

	Ke dumalana thata	Ke a dumalana	Ke fa gare	Ga ke dumele thata	Ga ke dumele golthelele
1. Ditshwetso tse dintsi tse di botlhokwa tsa lelawapa go molemo di dirwa ke rre wa lelwapa.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Go siame fela gore bomme ba nne le seabe mo mekgatlong, polotiking, jalo jalo, pele ga bana ba gola.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Go na le ditiro tsa borre le tsa bomme. Borre ga baa tshwanela go dira ditiro tsa bomme le bomme ga baa tshwanela go dira ditiro tsa borre.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Mme gaa tshwanela go solofela gore rre a mo thuse ditiro tsa mo lwapeng far rre a tswa tirong e tona ya letsatsi.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Mme yo o berekang/theogelang o ka nna le botsalano jo bo molemo le bana ba gagwe fela jaaka mme yo o sa berekeng.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Go siametse mongwe le mongwe fa rre a ka nna ene fela yo o berekang/theogelang fa mme a tlhokomela bana le lelwapa.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Bomme ba itumela segolo thata fa ba tlhola mo gae go tlhokomela bana le lelwapa.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Go botlhokwa thata fa mme a thusa/rotloetsa rre mo tirong ya gagwe go na le gore mme a nne le tiro ya gagwe ka sebele.	1	2	3	4	5

Spousal Support

	Ke dumalana thata	Ke a dumalana	Ke fa gare	Ga ke dumele thata	Ga ke dumele golthelele
1. Rre/mme wa me waa are sengwe ka nna, wa ntlhokomela.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Rre/mme wa me o mpotsa gore ke tlhotse jang.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Rre/mme wa me o nkamogela ka botlalo tota.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Fa ke na le letsatsi le le thata, rre/mme wa me o a nthotloetsa.	1	2	3	4	5

5. Fa ke tshewenyegile maikutlo, rre/mme wa me o a ntheetsa.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Rre/mme wa me o boutlwelobotlhoko fa ke tenegile/ngadile.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Fa ke tswa tirong ke lapile, rre/mme wa me o rata go thusa kwa lwapeng.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Ke mang yo o tsayang nako e ntsi a dira ditiro tsa mo lwapeng?	Ke nna	Rre/mme wa me	Nna le ene ka tekatekanyo		

Appendix J

Hypotheses 1 to 7 Subscales Tables

Hypothesis 1

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Gender Role Attitudes

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.146/.025 (.366)	-.169/-.048 (.221)	-.596/-.068 (.555)	-.156/-.080 (.122)
Family worship	1.307/.164 (.452) **	.733/.150 (.272) **	1.974/.165 (.685) **	.347/.130 (.151) *
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	-.913/-.063 (.976)	-.557/-.062 (.589)	-2.032/-.093 (1.479)	-.426/-.087 (.327)
11-15 years	-2.984/-.181 (1.118) **	-1.937/-.191 (.674) **	-3.863/-.156 (1.694) *	-1.327/-.240 (.374) ***
16-20 years	-2.216/-.094 (1.465)	-.807/-.056 (.883)	-.094/-.003 (2.220)	-.460/-.058 (.490)
21 years and above	-.845/-.039 (1.432)	-.331/-.025 (.863)	.621/.019 (2.170)	-.272/-.037 (.479)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.438/.076 (.353)	.711/.201 (.213) ***	.411/.048 (.535)	.214/.111 (.118) +
Occupation	.135/.036 (.212)	-.147/-.063 (.128)	-.114/-.020 (.322)	-.025/-.020 (.071)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-1.993/-.106 (1.105)	-.806/-.070 (.667)	-3.037/-.108 (1.675) +	-.398/-.063 (.370)
180,000 to 250,000	.942/.055 (1.056)	.237/.023 (.637)	-1.269/-.049 (1.601)	-.104/-.018 (.353)
253,000 to 325,000	1.480/.067 (3.352)	.980/.0721 (.815009)	1.792/.054 (2.048)	.502/.068 (.452)
333,000 and above	1.309/.068 (1.190)	3.981/.069 (3.530)	2.053/.071 (1.803)	.322/.050 (.398)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Gender Role Attitudes	.173/.152 (.066) **	.052/.074 (.040)	.126/.073 (.100)	.023/.059 (.022)
Constant	28.840	15.794	42.284	10.023
R square	.113	.147	.101	.119
Adjusted R square	.074	.109	.061	.080
R square change	.021	.005	.005	.003

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income.

Hypothesis 1 (cont.)

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Gender Role Attitudes

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.059/-.013 (.285)	.030/.009 (.211)	.137/.031 (.274)	.207/.050 (.258)	-.045/-.012 (.237)
Family worship	.794/.129 (.352) *	.093/.020 (.260)	.918/.151 (.338) **	.410/.072 (.319)	.419/.080 (.292)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	-.840/-.075 (.760)	.012/.002 (.562)	-1.533/-.139 (.731) *	-.990/-.096 (.689)	-.457/-.048 (.631)
11-15 years	-2.108/-.165 (.871) *	-1.231/-.132 (.644) +	-2.524/-.202 (.837) **	-2.012/-.172 (.789) *	-1.921/-.177 (.723) **
16-20 years	-1.596/-.087 (1.141)	-.140/-.010 (.843)	-2.287/-.127 (1.097) *	-2.071/-.123 (1.034) *	-2.464/-.158 (.947) **
21 years and above	.085/.005 (1.115)	-.259/-.021 (.824)	-2.020/-.122 (1.073) +	-.745/-.048 (1.011)	.034/.002 (.926)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	.160/.036 (.275)	.450/.138 (.203) *	.597/.137 (.264) *	.567/.139 (.249) +	.673/.178 (.228) **
Occupation	-.025/-.009 (.165)	-.143/-.067 (.122)	.076/.026 (.159)	.025/.009 (.150)	-.047/-.019 (.137)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-1.162/-.080 (.861)	-1.328/-.125 (.636) *	-1.209/-.085 (.828) +	-1.298/-.097 (.780) +	-1.699/-.137 (.715) *
180,000 to 250,000	.484/.037 (.823)	-.765/-.079 (.608)	.435/.033 (.791)	.503/.041 (.746)	-.387/-.034 (.683)
253,000 to 325,000	1.894/.111 (1.053) +	.761/.060 (.778)	.113/.007 (1.012)	.720/.046 (.954)	.556/.038 (.874)
333,000 and above	-.044/-.003 (.927)	.116/.011 (.685)	-.181/-.012 (.891)	.795/.058 (.840)	.133/.010 (.770)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Gender Role Attitudes	.144/.163 (.051) **	.070/.108 (.038) +	.188/.217 (.049) ***	.159/.196 (.047) ***	.117/.155 (.043) **
Constant	16.431	16.443	13.898	13.959	15.506
R square	.101	.091	.140	.125	.146
Adjusted R square	.061	.050	.102	.086	.109
R square change	.024	.010	.042	.034	.022

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income.

Hypothesis 2

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Spousal Support

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.128/.022 (.270)	-.150/-.042 (.177)	-.525/-.060 (.411)	-.139/-.071 (.095)
Family worship	.515/.065 (.337)	.347/.071 (.221)	.890/.074 (.513) +	.125/.047 (.119)
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	.277/.019 (.727)	.023/.003 (.477)	-.408/-.019 (1.107)	-.094/-.019 (.256)
11-15 years	-.956/-.058 (.841)	-.894/-.088 (.552)	-.908/-.037 (1.280)	-.718/-.130 (.296) *
16-20 years	-.808/-.034 (1.094)	-.048/-.003 (.717)	2.075/.058 (1.664)	-.010/-.001 (.385)
21 years and above	.183/.008 (1.066)	.169/.013 (.699)	2.022/.062 (1.622)	.014/.002 (.375)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.163/.028 (.261)	.537/.152 (.171) **	-.098/-.011 (.397)	.107/.055 (.092)
Occupation	.096/.025 (.156)	-.148/-.064 (.102)	-.108/-.019 (.238)	-.023/-.018 (.055)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-.790/-.042 (.822)	-.235/-.020 (.539)	-1.446/-.051 (1.250)	-.074/-.012 (.289)
180,000 to 250,000	2.033/.119 (.789) *	.812/.077 (.518)	.366/.014 (1.201)	.234/.041 (.278)
253,000 to 325,000	1.375/.062 (1.006)	.901/.066 (.660)	1.557/.047 (1.530)	.451/.061 (.354)
333,000 and above	1.705/.088 (.880) +	.424/.036 (.577)	2.370/.081 (1.338) +	.381/.059 (.309)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Spousal Support	.625/.670 (.040) ***	.325/.568 (.026) ***	.924/.659 (.060) ***	.191/.610 (.014) ***
Constant	17.719	8.790	21.726	5.667
R square	.509	.441	.498	.461
Adjusted R square	.487	.416	.476	.437
R square change	.416	.299	.402	.345

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income.

Hypothesis 2 (cont.)

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Spousal Support

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.071/-.016 (.190)	.029/.009 (.175)	.087/.020 (.190)	.164/.040 (.198)	-.056/-.015 (.164)
Family worship	.115/.019 (.237)	-.268/-.059 (.219)	.238/.039 (.237)	-.160/-.028 (.247)	-.127/-.024 (.205)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	.181/.016 (.512)	.554/.067 (.473)	-.509/-.046 (.512)	-.131/-.013 (.533)	.364/.038 (.442)
11-15 years	-.361/-.028 (.592)	-.293/-.031 (.547)	-.847/-.068 (.592)	-.607/-.052 (.616)	-.519/-.048 (.511)
16-20 years	-.379/-.021 (.769)	.520/.039 (.711)	-1.165/-.065 (.769)	-1.131/-.067 (.801)	-1.488/-.096 (.664) *
21 years and above	.967/.057 (.750)	.209/.017 (.693)	-1.135/-.068 (.750)	-.002/.000 (.781)	.743/.052 (.647)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	-.082/-.018 (.184)	.314/.096 (.170) +	.408/.094 (.184) *	.409/.100 (.191) *	.481/.127 (.159) **
Occupation	-.057/-.020 (.110)	-.156/-.073 (.102)	.021/.007 (.110)	-.022/-.008 (.114)	-.072/-.029 (.095)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-.133/-.009 (.578)	-.784/-.074 (.534)	-.156/-.011 (.578)	-.415/-.031 (.602)	-.871/-.070 (.499) +
180,000 to 250,000	1.425/.108 (.555) *	-.257/-.026 (.513)	1.320/.101 (.555) *	1.245/.102 (.578) *	.369/.033 (.479)
253,000 to 325,000	1.801/.105 (.707) *	.706/.056 (.654)	.057/.003 (.707)	.673/.043 (.736)	.482/.033 (.611)
333,000 and above	.287/.019 (.619)	.279/.025 (.572)	.240/.016 (.619)	1.150/.084 (.644) +	.401/.032 (.534)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Spousal Support	.539/.747 (.028) ***	.290/.547 (.026) ***	.512/.721 (.028) ***	.429/.647 (.029) ***	.432/.703 (.024) ***
Constant	6.687	10.962	6.268	7.596	7.722
R square	.594	.357	.580	.479	.583
Adjusted R square	.576	.329	.561	.456	.565
R square change	.517	.277	.482	.388	.459

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income.

Hypothesis 3

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Age

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.079/.014 (.388)	-.165/-.046 (.232)	-.745/-.086 (.583)	-.221/-.114 (.128) +
Family worship	1.169/.147 (.456) *	.684/.140 (.273) *	1.906/.159 (.686) **	.347/.130 (.151) *
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	-.584/-.040 (1.026)	-.403/-.045 (.613)	-2.020/-.092 (1.542)	-.511/-.105 (.340)
11-15 years	-2.662/-.162 (1.244) *	-1.741/-.172 (.744) *	-4.036/-.163 (1.870) *	-1.514/-.274 (.412) ***
16-20 years	-1.947/-.082 (1.665)	-.581/-.040 (.995)	-.496/.014 (2.502)	-.760/-.096 (.551)
21 years and above	-.216/-.010 (1.721)	.036/.003 (1.028)	.350/.011 (2.586)	-.600/-.082 (.569)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.573/.100 (.353)	.751/.213 (.211) ***	.511/.059 (.530)	.233/.121 (.117) *
Occupation	.059/.016 (.213)	-.166/-.072 (.127)	-.182/-.032 (.320)	-.043/-.034 (.070)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-1.759/-.094 (1.114)	-.743/-.064 (.666)	-2.841/-.101 (1.674) +	-.353/-.056 (.369)
180,000 to 250,000	.907/.053 (1.068)	.224/.021 (.638)	-1.284/-.050 (1.605)	-.103/-.018 (.353)
253,000 to 325,000	1.629/.074 (1.368)	1.040/.076 (.818)	1.837/.055 (2.056)	.486/.065 (.453)
333,000 and above	1.665/.086 (1.195)	.402/.034 (.714)	2.316/.080 (1.796)	.371/.057 (.395)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Age	-.210/-.041 (.418)	-.142/-.045 (.250)	.174/.023 (.628)	.156/.091 (.138)
Constant	34.557	17.599	46.070	10.556
R square	.093	.143	.096	.119
Adjusted R square	.053	.105	.056	.081
R square change	.001	.001	.000	.004

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income.

Hypothesis 3 (cont.)

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Age

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.180/-.040 (.303)	-.024/-.007 (.222)	.121/.027 (.294)	-.004/.000 (.276)	-.083/-.022 (.251)
Family worship	.701/.114 (.356) *	.046/.010 (.261)	.750/.124 (.345) *	.332/.059 (.324)	.324/.062 (.295)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	-.714/-.064 (.801)	.083/.010 (.588)	-1.046509/-.095 (.777)	-1.027/-.099 (.729)	-.217/-.023 (.664)
11-15 years	-2.104/-.165 (.971) *	-1.213/-.130 (.712) +	-1.944/-.155 (.941) *	-2.324/-.199 (.884) **	-1.672/-.154 (.805) *
16-20 years	-1.761/-.096 (1.299)	-.196/-.015 (.953)	-1.659/-.092 (1.260)	-2.714/-.162 (1.183) *	-2.236/-.144 (1.078) *
21 years and above	.134/.008 (1.343)	-.205/-.016 (.985)	-.925/-.056 (1.302)	-1.255/.081 (1.223)	.517/.036 (1.114)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	.273/.061 (.275)	.505/.155 (.202) *	.743/.170 (.267) **	.692/.170 (.251) **	.765/.202 (.228) ***
Occupation	-.098/-.033 (.166)	-.177/-.083 (.122)	.000/.000 (.161)	-.065/-.024 (.151)	-.097/-.039 (.138)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-.950/-.066 (.869)	-1.226/-.115 (.638) +	-.969/-.068 (.843)	-1.045/-.078 (.792)	-1.543/-.125 (.721) *
180,000 to 250,000	.462/.035 (.834)	-.776/-.080 (.612)	.390/.030 (.808)	.487/.040 (.759)	-.412/-.036 (.691)
253,000 to 325,000	1.977/.115 (1.068) +	.804/.064 (.784)	.312/.019 (1.035)	.762/.048 (.972)	.662/.045 (.886)
333,000 and above	.255/.017 (.933)	.261/.024 (.684)	.204/.014 (.904)	1.127/.082 (.849)	.374/.029 (.774)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Age	.038/.010 (.326)	.005/.002 (.239)	-.412/-.106 (.316)	.295/.081 (.297)	-.168/-.050 (.270)
Constant	20.945	18.658	20.334	18.634	19.400
R square	.077	.080	.103	.094	.126
Adjusted R square	.036	.040	.063	.054	.087
R square change	.000	.000	.005	.003	.001

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 4

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Gender

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.001/.000 (.388)	-.217/-.061 (.219)	-.730/-.084 (.5549)	-.178/-.092 (.121)
Family worship	1.221/.153 (.455) **	.719/.147 (.272) **	1.974/.165 (.681) **	.344/.128 (.151) *
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	-.749/-.052 (.984)	-.515/-.058 (.588)	-1.951/-.089 (1.472)	-.410/-.084 (.326)
11-15 years	-2.947/-.179 (1.129) **	-1.934/-.191 (.675) **	-3.884/-.157 (1.691) *	-1.328/-.240 (.374) ***
16-20 years	-1.436/-.103 (1.483)	-.910/-.063 (.886)	-.471/.013 (2.220)	-.516/-.065 (.491)
21 years and above	-.727/-.033 (1.446)	-.310/-.023 (.864)	.621/.019 (2.164)	-.268/-.037 (.479)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.562/.098 (.353)	.743/.211 (.211) ***	.477/.055 (.528)	.228/.118 (.117) +
Occupation	.002/.001 (.218)	-.204/-.088 (.130)	-.309/-.054 (.327)	-.055/-.044 (.072)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-1.686/-.090 (1.114)	-.695/-.060 (.666)	-2.699/-.096 (1.668)	-.343/-.055 (.369)
180,000 to 250,000	.876/.051 (1.068)	.204/.019 (.638)	-1.395/-.054 (1.598)	-.123/-.021 (.354)
253,000 to 325,000	1.453/.066 (1.372)	.924/.068 (.820)	1.496/.045 (2.054)	.464/.062 (.455)
333,000 and above	1.609/.083 (1.196)	.366/.031 (.715)	2.152/.074 (1.790)	.347/.053 (.396)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Gender	-.705/-.053 (.766)	-.462/-.057 (.458)	-1.960/-.099 (1.147)	-.274/-.062 (.254)
Constant	35.681	18.329	50.082	11.272
R square	.095	.145	.105	.119
Adjusted R square	.055	.107	.065	.080
R square change	.003	.003	.009	.003

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 4 (cont.)

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Gender

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.189/-.042 (.285)	-.029/-.009 (.210)	-.014/-.003 (.278)	.072/.017 (.260)	-.150/-.039 (.236)
Family worship	.743/.120 (.354) *	.060/.013 (.260)	.810/.134 (.345) *	.336/.059 (.323)	.378/.072 (.294)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	-.716/-.064 (.764)	.078/.009 (.563)	-1.345/-.122 (.746) +	.842/-.082 (.698)	-.356/-.037 (.635)
11-15 years	-2.092/-.164 (.878) *	-1.217/-.130 (.647) +	-2.472/-.197 (.857) **	-1.982/-.169 (.802) *	-1.909/-.176 (.729) **
16-20 years	-1.849/-.101 (1.153)	-.235/-.018 (.849)	-2.475/-.138 (1.125) *	-2.289/-.136 (1.053) *	-2.669/-.171 (.957) **
21 years and above	.156/.009 (1.124)	-.213/-.017 (.828)	-1.871/-.113 (1.097) +	-.643/-.041 (1.027)	.092/.006 (.933)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	.255/.057 (.274)	.500/.153 (.202) *	.737/.169 (.268) **	.678/.166 (.251) **	.750/.198 (.228) ***
Occupation	-.168/-.058 (.170)	-.199/-.093 (.125)	-.046/-.016 (.166)	-.105/-.039 (.155)	-.162/-.065 (.141)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-.870/-.060 (.866)	-1.201/-.113 (.638) +	-.902/-.063 (.845)	-1.008/-.076 (.791)	-1.462/-.118 (.719) *
180,000 to 250,000	.404/.030 (.830)	-.794/-.081 (.611)	.381/.029 (.810)	.436/.036 (.758)	-.452/-.040 (.689)
253,000 to 325,000	1.783/.104 (1.067) +	.743/.059 (.786)	.149/.009 (1.041)	.674/.043 (.975)	.466/.032 (.885)
333,000 and above	.167/.011 (.929)	.234/.021 (.685)	.173/.012 (.907)	1.061/.077 (.849)	.305/.024 (.771)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Gender	-1.052/-.103 (.595) +	-.326/-.043 (.439)	-.429/-.043 (.581)	-.758/-.081 (.544)	-.852/-.098 (.494) +
Constant	23.032	19.296	20.684	20.453	20.859
R square	.086	.082	.099	.097	.133
Adjusted R square	.046	.041	.059	.057	.095
R square change	.010	.002	.002	.006	.009

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 5

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Interaction of Age and gender

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.152/.026 (.376)	-.130/-.036 (.225)	-.486/-.056 (.564)	-.174/-.090 (.125)
Family worship	1.170/.147 (.453) **	.687/.140 (.271) *	1.860/.155 (.680) **	.332/.124 (.151) *
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	-.379/-.026 (1.006)	-.300/-.034 (.602)	-1.373/-.063 (1.512)	-.405/-.083 (.335)
11-15 years	-2.271/-.138 (1.201) +	-1.543/-.152 (.718) *	-2.841/-.115 (1.805)	-1.324/-.240 (.400) ***
16-20 years	-1.495/-.063 (1.569)	-.361/-.025 (.938)	1.073/.030 (2.357)	-.482/-.061 (.522)
21 years and above	.450/.021 (1.615)	.370/.028 (.965)	2.438/.074 (2.425)	-.260/-.036 (.537)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.565/.099 (.352)	.746/.212 (.210) ***	.498/.058 (.528)	.232/.121 (.117) *
Occupation	-.004/-.001 (.214)	-.204/-.088 (.128)	-.257/-.045 (.322)	-.036/-.028 (.071)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-1.740/-.093 (1.109)	-.730/-.063 (.663)	-2.851/-.101 (1.667) +	-.365/-.058 (.369)
180,000 to 250,000	.844/.049 (1.065)	.189/.018 (.637)	-1.394/-.054 (1.600)	-.107/-.019 (.354)
253,000 to 325,000	1.495/.068 (1.362)	.958/.070 (.815)	1.731/.052 (2.046)	.517/.070 (.453)
333,000 and above	1.521/.079 (1.195)	.320/.027 (.714)	2.095/.072 (1.795)	.371/.057 (.397)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Interaction of age and gender	-.328/-.112 (.210)	-.189/-.105 (.126)	-.491/-.111 (.316)	.003/.003 (.070)
Constant	35.238	17.965	47.663	10.732
R square	.100	.148	.103	.116
Adjusted R square	.060	.111	.064	.077
R square change	.007	.006	.007	.000

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 5 (cont.)

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Interaction of Age and Gender

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.067/-.015 (.293)	.006/.002 (.216)	.127/.029 (.284)	.129/.031 (.268)	-.001/.000 (.242)
Family worship	.682/.111 (.354) +	.041/.009 (.260)	.772/.127 (.343) *	.297/.052 (.323)	.322/.061 (.292)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	-.427/-.038 (.785)	.161/.019 (.578)	-.995/-.090 (.761)	-.712/-.069 (.718)	.006/.001 (.648)
11-15 years	-1.573/-.123 (.938) +	-1.069/-.114 (.690)	-1.828/-.146 (.909) *	-1.753/-.150 (.858) *	-1.248/-.115 (.774)
16-20 years	-1.072/-.059 (1.224)	-.011/.000 (.901)	-1.606/-.089 (1.187)	-1.915/-.114 (1.120) +	-1.734/-.111 (1.011) +
21 years and above	1.061/.063 (1.260)	.046/.004 (.927)	-.750/-.045 (1.221)	-.243/-.016 (1.152)	1.241/.086 (1.040)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	.266/.060 (.274)	.503/.154 (.202) *	.737/.169 (.266) **	.689/.169 (.251) **	.757/.200 (.227) ***
Occupation	-.137/-.047 (.167)	-.189/-.088 (.123)	-.069/-.024 (.162)	-.070/-.026 (.153)	-.157/-.063 (.138)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-.952/-.066 (.866)	-1.226/-.115 (.637) +	-.934/-.065 (.839)	-1.068/-.080 (.792)	-1.527/-.123 (.715) *
180,000 to 250,000	.409/.031 (.831)	-.791/-.081 (.612)	.337/.026 (.806)	.455/.037 (.790)	-.473/-.042 (.686)
253,000 to 325,000	1.915/.112 (1.063) +	.785/.062 (.782)	.141/.008 (1.030)	.790/.050 (.972)	.539/.037 (.877)
333,000 and above	.146/.010 (.932)	.230/.021 (.686)	.067/.005 (.904)	1.078/.079 (.853)	.233/.018 (.769)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Interaction of age and gender	-.243/-.107 (.164)	-.069/-.041 (.121)	-.317/-.142 (.159)	-.102/-.049 (.150)	-.317/-.164 (.135) *
Constant	21.677	18.859	20.746	19.269	20.101
R square	.083	.081	.109	.092	.141
Adjusted R square	.043	.041	.070	.052	.103
R square change	.007	.001	.012	.001	.016

+ $p \leq .10$ * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 6

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the four subscales of marital satisfaction by Age, Gender, Spousal Support and Gender Role Attitudes

Variable	Dyadic Satisfaction	Dyadic Cohesion	Dyadic Consensus	Affection Expression
Number of children at home	.217/.038 (.290)	-.118/-.033 (.191)	-.614/-.071 (.443)	-.210/-.108 (.102) *
Family worship	.569/.071 (.342) +	.344/.070 (.225)	.933/.078 (.522) +	.132/.049 (.120)
Length of Marriage				
5-10 years	.237/.016 (.762)	.078/.009 (.502)	-.605/-.028 (1.164)	-.237/-.049 (.268)
11-15 years	-.900/-.055 (.931)	-.786/-.078 (.614)	-1.256/-.051 (1.422)	-.986/-.178 (.327) **
16-20 years	-.606/-.026 (1.235)	.115/.008 (.814)	1.532/.043 (1.887)	-.397/-.050 (.434)
21 years and above	.290/.013 (1.287)	.365/.027 (.849)	1.406/.043 (1.969)	-.476/-.065 (.453)
1-4 years (Omitted)				
Education	.102/.018 (.264)	.532/.151 (.174) **	-.101/-.012 (.403)	.114/.059 (.093)
Occupation	.143/.038 (.162)	-.144/-.062 (.107)	-.143/-.025 (.247)	-.022/-.017 (.057)
Income (in Pula)				
100,310 to 175,000	-.934/-.050 (.826)	-.250/-.022 (.545)	-1.398/-.050 (1.262)	-.056/-.009 (.290)
180,000 to 250,000	2.033/.119 (.791) *	.806/.077 (.521)	.353/.014 (1.208)	.256/.045 (.278)
253,000 to 325,000	1.351/.061 (1.013)	.910/.067 (.667)	1.438/.043 (1.546)	.447/.060 (.355)
333,000 and above	1.534/.079 (.889) +	.408/.034 (.586)	2.346/.081 (1.357) +	.415/.064 (.312)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)				
Age	-.087/-.017 (.333)	-.092/-.029 (.219)	.266/.035 (.508)	.229/.134 (.117) *
Gender	.045/.003 (.622)	-.034/-.004 (.410)	-.353/-.018 (.950)	.194/.044 (.218)
Spousal Support	.617/.662 (.040) ***	.324/.566 (.027) ***	.923/.657 (.061) ***	.194/.619 (.014) ***
Gender Role Attitudes	.084/.074 (.050) +	.006/.008 (.033)	.000/.00 (.077)	-.007/-.019 (.018)
Constant	15.282	8.812	22.179	5.176
R square	.514	.441	.499	.468
Adjusted R square	.487	.410	.472	.439
R square change	.421	.299	.403	.352

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Hypothesis 7

Unstandardized and Standardized OLS regression coefficients for variables predicting the five subscales of intimacy by Age, Gender, Gender Role Attitudes and Spousal support

Variable	Emotional Intimacy	Social Intimacy	Sexual Intimacy	Intellectual Intimacy	Recreational intimacy
Number of children at home	-.046/-.010 (.203)	.027/.008 (.189)	.274/.062 (.200)	.124/.030 (.210)	.035/.009 (.175)
Family worship	.194/.031 (.240)	-.246/-.054 (.223)	.301/.050 (.236)	-.046/-.008 (.247)	-.074/-.014 (.201)
Length of Marriage					
5-10 years	.030/.003 (.535)	.468/.057 (.497)	-.423/-.038 (.526)	-.508/-.049 (.551)	.394/.041 (.461)
11-15 years	-.516/-.041 (.653)	-.407/-.044 (.607)	-.514/-.041 (.643)	-1.129/-.096 (.673) +	-.366/-.034 (.563)
16-20 years	-.534/-.29 (.866)	.401/.030 (.806)	-.521/-.029 (.853)*	-1.764/-.105 (.893) *	-1.214/-.078 (.748)
21 years and above	.704/.042 (.904)	.002/.000 (.841)	-.521/-.031 (.890)	-.933/-.060 (.932)	1.038/.072 (.780)
1-4 years (Omitted)					
Education	-.138/-.031 (.185)	.296/.091 (.172) +	.322/.074 (.182) +	.338/.083 (.191) +	.431/.114 (.160) **
Occupation	-.046/-.016 (.114)	-.137/-.064 (.106)	.085/.030 (.112)	.010/.004 (.117)	-.065/-.026 (.098)
Income (in Pula)					
100,310 to 175,000	-.221/-.015 (.578)	-.830/-.078 (.539)	-.365/-.026 (.571)	-.540/-.041 (.597)	-.954/-.077 (.500) +
180,000 to 250,000	1.407/-.106 (.555) *	-.245/-.025 (.516)	1.301/.100 (.546) *	1.258/.103 (.572) *	.333/-.030 (.479)
253,000 to 325,000	1.686/.098 (.710) *	.698/.055 (.660)	.037/.002 (.699)	.537/.034 (.732)	.399/.027 (.613)
333,000 and above	.112/.007 (.623)	.234/.021 (.580)	-.015/-.001 (.614)	.945/.069 (.643)	.236/.019 (.538)
0 to 100,000 (Omitted)					
Age	.074/.019 (.233)	.084/.029 (.217)	-.334/-.086 (.230)	.370/.102 (.240)	-.175/-.052 (.201)
Gender	-.307/-.030 (.436)	.131/.017 (.406)	-.087/-.009 (.430)	-.027/-.003 (.450)	-.424/-.049 (.377)
Gender Role Attitudes	.072/.082 (.035) *	.027/.042 (.033)	.117/.135 (.035) ***	.099/.123 (.036) **	.061/.082 (.030) *
Spousal Support	.530/.735 (.028) ***	.289/.545 (.026) ***	.499/.704 (.028) ***	.420/.634 (.029) ***	.423/.688 (.024) ***
Constant	5.142	9.779	3.447	4.289	7.053
R square	.600	.360	.599	.497	.590
Adjusted R square	.578	.325	.577	.469	.568
R square change	.523	.280	.501	.406	.466

+ p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01; *** p≤.001. Standard errors in parenthesis

Controlling for number of children living at home, family worship, length of marriage, education, occupation, and income

Appendix K

Letter of Authorization/Collaboration

TELEPHONE: 3611100
FAX: 3907426



REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND HOME AFFAIRS
PRIVATE BAG 002
GABORONE

REF: C HA 1/17/1 XIII (31)

13 February 2009

Mr Kagiso Henry Rakwena
24570 Stewart Street, Apt. 35
Loma Linda
California, 92354
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dear Sir

**RE: APPLICATION TO EXTEND RESEARCH PERMIT TO DOCUMENT THE
ROLE OF AGE AND GENDER ON MARITAL SATISFACTION AND
INTIMACY IN BOTSWANA**

Your application for an extension of your Research Permit refers.

Pleased be informed that your permit **ref CHA 1/17/2 XII (4I)** dated **13 October 2008** has been extended by one academic year effective **March 2009 to December 2009**. Please note that all other conditions remain valid and binding.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

A blue ink signature, appearing to be 'B. A. Majola', written over a horizontal line.

B. A. Majola
For/PERMANENT SECRETARY

Tds/BAM